NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXLV.

DECEMBER, 1893.

POLITICAL CAUSES OF THE BUSINESS DEPRESSION.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS.

THAT business depression exists and has existed since midsummer no one doubts. Much as we deplore this fact, the painful proof of it is manifest; confident as we are that the worst is over and the country is now on the road to recovery, it is certainly true that a general depression, starting with stringency of money and a financial panic, has extended through all branches of business and has brought suffering and misery. It is equally true that this condition has not been limited to our country, but has been world-wide in extent, and is in part due to world-wide causes which it is quite beyond the power of legislation here, past or future, to control.

The fact remains, however, that legislation cannot escape its share of responsibility. Unwise laws can impair confidence, shake credit and disturb industrial stability, until the people, under the stress of suffering, demand and get remedial legislation by repeal or otherwise. Political action in this country can and does to a large extent affect our industrial interests. How far this connection of business with politics is wise or proper, it is not my purpose now to discuss.

Because it exists, economic and financial questions have, espec-

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ially in late years, received prominent attention in political campaigns. Carefully, thoughtfully, the people have considered these matters in the firm belief that political action would affect their own material welfare. Since 1888 the political issues have been largely on these lines, and while other and sometimes local questions have also been considered, the attention of the country has been directed most to important matters of national and economic policy.

It is not strange then that again this year the old questions should have arisen. While it is an "off year," with only a few State elections, and those involving largely local issues, yet business depression and popular belief that its cause and remedy are to be found in legislation have brought both parties sharply to face the issue of responsibility for present conditions.

Unfortunately the issue is complicated by the political situation. The Democratic party is in power, but Republican laws and policy are still in force. There has not been time yet to change or repeal these with the exception of a single measure, and that one only by a special session of a Democratic Congress convened by a Democratic President.

All other laws remain. The Republican policy upon tariff and finance, with this exception, is still the law of the land. Our revenue is still raised under Republican taxation, and our money spent under Republican appropriations. If mills are closed and men idle, it is well to remember that the McKinley Bill and high protection are still in full force; if the cause of sound money is threatened, that the Sherman law has only just been repealed; if there is an increasing deficit in the Treasury approaching fifty million dollars a year, that the Democratic party left in March, 1889, a surplus of over one hundred millions, and that our income and expenses since have been determined by Republican laws.

There has been a change only of the party in power with no fair chance yet to make the people's will and Democratic policy the law of the land. As measures are more important than men, so the acts and laws of a party have the larger share of responsibility for results dependent upon political control. A Democratic administration with Republican laws to enforce is not responsible for those laws, nor for their evil results, until at least it has had opportunity to change them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No doubt a suffering people are apt to lay their ills to the party in power. It is easy to say to an idle workingman: "Your party has won a national victory, and now you are out of a job," and to ask him to believe that the one fact has caused the other. However untrue this conclusion, it is hard to reach him, and to show him the real facts and the true causes of his idleness, especially in the haste and excitement of a short campaign. No doubt this Republican appeal to idle men, and this tendency to attribute hard times to the governing party, were important factors in the recent elections, and the Democratic party had to suffer for causes it did not create and over which it had little control. Now that the election is over the people will more carefully and fairly consider the situation and measure party responsibility for it.

Realizing its responsibility for present laws, the Republican party seeks to escape from it by claiming that not these laws but the fear of laws which are to be enacted has shaken confidence and brought adversity. This then is the issue—Is our admitted distress due to existing Republican legislation which the country has condemned and ordered to be repealed, or to impending Democratic legislation which is to carry out the people's will?

Let us see what the situation is: We find the country suffering from a diminished revenue, increased expenditures, a reduced gold reserve and a flood of useless silver. The Republican party through its McKinley Bill declared its purpose to shut off imports and so reduce revenue. Then it set the precedent of a billion-dollar Congress, and by its laws fastened this expenditure on the future. Then for partisan purposes, and with the aid of Territories which it created States, protection and silver through the Republican party made their coalition for a double burden on the people and passed the Silver Bill against the unanimous protest of the Democratic party. Four years of reckless, extravagant legislation had to be paid for by impaired confidence, with the inevitable result of panic and distress. Although the evil of the Sherman Bill was continually becoming more clear and burdensome, its authors in their State and National conventions either openly indorsed it or uttered no word of protest against it, until at last a financial crisis, due principally to it, broke their silence and forced them to lend their aid in undoing their own mischief. Then they claimed that the bill was passed to prevent the free coinage of silver. But at the time of its passage the House had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already defeated free coinage, and it was known that the President would veto it. Their excuse means that over a Presidential veto a Republican Senate and a Republican House by a two-thirds vote would have supported free coinage though a majority of the House had just voted the other way. The country does not credit this excuse. It believes that the Sherman Bill was passed less from a patriotic purpose to avert danger than from a political purpose to risk a danger in order to save the silver-mining States to the Republican party and to facilitate the passage of the McKinley Bill. So Republicans themselves have declared. Senator Teller, in the recent debate upon the repeal of the Sherman Bill, said :

"I want to refer to the statement made by the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Sherman) that the Sherman law was passed to save the country from a free coinage act. The Senator from Ohio was the Chairman of the Conference Committee which framed that act; and on the floor of the Senate, when he made the report, he stated in the most emphatic manner that the House of Representatives had determined in a very positive way that no free coinage bill could pass that body. Mr. President, I say here now with all due deference to the honorable Senator, and trying to keep as closely within the rules of senatorial decency and courtesy as the circumstances will admit, that his present statement was an afterthought. The records will not support it. The matter was brought here in that shape for the reason that it was supposed it would quiet the agitation and would maintain intact in the Northwest the Republican column of States. We were told in plain, unmistakable language that this might be a sop to our people which would save us and save our political organization in that great section of the country and that we could get nothing better. I repeat, Mr. President, there was not a man in this body nor anywhere else, who gave attention to this subject, who did not know we had reached a point where it was absolutely impossible to pass a free coinage bill."

Another Republican, Senator Jones, of Nevada, is quoted in the Boston *Daily Advertiser* of September 6, 1893, as having said to his associates in the Conference Committee, which framed the Sherman Bill, these words :

"'Now I want to tell you, gentlemen, that the McKinley Bill will be over in the Senate in a very short time. If you reject our ultimatum on the silver proposition the silver men in the Senate will move the free coinage bill as an amendment to the McKinley Bill, and there are enough Democrats who will vote with us to carry it. Now after that amendment is adopted in the Senate, all the Democrats will vote against the McKinley Bill because it is a protective measure, and the Eastern protectionists will vote against it because it contains free silver. The free silver Republicans in the Senate will be the only men who will vote for it; and being protectionists they will be the only consistent men in the Senate, being for protection and for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free coinage of silver.' When I got through they were listening to me, and before the conference broke up the silver purchase law known as the Sherman Act was agreed to. If there are many more misrepresentations on the floor of the Senate as to the reasons why the act of 1890 was agreed to and came about, I will take the floor and explain what occurred and how it came to be adopted."

And again, but a few days ago, in the closing debate on the repeal of the Sherman Bill, at least one other Republican Senator in effect repeated the charge and served notice that the coalition of silver and protection was ended because the Republican party had not kept faith with silver.

It is true that neither party is united upon this question, but the difference between them is that at the critical moment the Republican party yields to financial heresy in its ranks and the Democratic party conquers it. This was strikingly shown by the Democratic administration from 1884 to 1888. Its unflinching stand for sound money was met by the criticism and opposition of the Republican party, expressed in the Republican national convention of 1888, later by Republican leaders, notably by Mr. McKinley, who said in his speech at Toledo, February, 1891:

"During all of his (Cleveland's) years as the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of our precious metals, one of our great products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He endeavored even before his inauguration to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards and to the end of his administration persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and demonetize one of the coins of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce and therefore dear. He would have increased the value of money and diminished the value of everything else—money the master, everything else the servant."

This was followed by Republican acts in admitting the silver Territories and in the passage of the Sherman Bill. Always the spirit of compromise was dominating that party and giving new life and vigor to its financial unsoundness. Contrast with this the action of the Democratic party not only from 1884 to 1888, but later in meeting division within its ranks upon this question. With an overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives in 1892 it fought and conquered the demand for the passage of silver legislation, believed by the country to be unsound and unsafe. It faced the issue again in its national convention, and settled it not by compromise, but by argument and the triumphant assertion of a sound principle and policy; and then, as its pledge for the future, it nominated as its candidate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the one man most conspicuous before the country for consistent, steadfast devotion to such policy. Again, within a few weeks, when a general demand arose for the repeal of so much of the Sherman Bill as business men believed had been the great cause of depression, and the Democratic party properly was called upon to face this responsibility, it found united action impossible and the only course open concession or a fight. It chose the latter, although the fatal spirit of compromise was in the air. Such compromise was suggested by Republican precedents, but Democratic precedents and pledges prevailed, and unconditional repeal, through a fight, obtained a great and deserved victory. Ex-Speaker Reed has recently said that this was a victory of the Democratic President over his party. A Democratic President was indeed at the helm, but a Democratic crew was aboard the ship, and, while he "kept the rudder true," together they sailed the ship out of financial shoals into safe waters. The President stood for right and led his party, instead of following the precedent set by his predecessor, who yielded to wrong because led by his party. Democratic State conventions have, almost without exception, declared this leadership to be the expression and enforcement of true Democratic principles. I believe that Republican action on the silver question, marked as it has been by bargains, concessions and compromises culminating in the Sherman Bill, has been the chief cause of business depression. That bill cannot escape responsibility, as Republicans contend, on the ground that the panic did not come until three years after its passage. It took time for it to make its evil fully felt, and it will take time to recover from that evil now that the cause has ceased.

Through these three years the Sherman Bill has steadily been doing its mischievous work, heaping up silver, driving out gold and impairing the public confidence that our increasing currency could be kept at par with gold. During the administration of President Harrison, from March, 1889, to March, 1893, the treasury gold, outside of the reserve of $100,000,000, fell from $96,000,000 to $3,000,000, while our paper currency, outside of the $346,000,000 of legal tenders, rose from $246,000,000 to $448,000,000. The proportion of free gold to this currency fell from thirty-nine to less than one per cent. Time was constantly making matters worse. The crisis had got to come. The man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who fell from the third story window to the sidewalk declared that it was not the fall that hurt him, but bringing up so suddenly on the ground. Under the Sherman Bill the country had been steadily falling and was certain to bring up with a round turn at the end. The best proof that this was the cause of the business depression comes from business itself. In the midst of its distress it knew and stated the cause of it and the remedy. From boards of trade and business centres all over the country there came a unanimous demand. For what? To let the tariff alone? No, but to repeal the Sherman Bill. Impatient of delay, as if its very life depended upon this action, business watched the movement for repeal. Every step in that movement it felt and indicated as keenly as the barometer does a change of weather. It said emphatically through its representative boards that the one predominant cause of its trouble was the financial legislation of a Republican Congress and the one remedy was its repeal. As this remedy was delayed by weeks and months of discussion and obstruction, the business depression became more serious and so deep rooted that now the repeal itself cannot produce an immediate cure.

But the Republican party, anxious to escape its responsibility, insists that the crisis was due, not to its laws, but to impending Democratic laws; that we have not been reaping the whirlwind Republicans have sown, but are suffering because the country, by a large majority, has thrust them from power and condemned their financial and tariff policy. Let us examine their claim. What is or was the impending Democratic legislation at the time of the crisis? First, the repeal of the mischievous provisions of the Republican Sherman Bill. To that the Democratic party was pledged; for that a Democratic President had called together a Democratic Congress in special session, which now has redeemed the pledge and met the responsibility that rested upon it. Undoubtedly this impending legislation was not feared as a cause of trouble, but hoped for as a necessary remedy. Next is the repeal of the McKinley Bill. It is true the Democratic party has, by the deliberate, repeated judgment of the people, been charged with this duty, which it means faithfully to meet, and so obey the people's mandate to reduce the tariff. But we emphatically assert that the promise of such reduction has not caused present depression; but on the contrary that the reduction,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when accomplished, will be only a blessing to the people and their industries. We know that the Republicans tell the laborer out of work that a Democratic victory which condemned unjust taxation, and promised that the power of the people's government would be used not for selfish interests but for the equal benefit of all,—that this has brought him idleness and poverty. They neglect to tell him that he is still living under high protection and the McKinley Bill, or that after three years of trial it has failed to give him its promised benefits of work, high wages and prosperity. If called upon to meet this fact, they excuse the failure of that law by asserting in the words of Mr. Reed that "The McKinley Bill is in prison under sentence of death," and they ask with him, "How can it help you or me?" No doubt that is its condition. It was charged with the crime of robbery, tried before the people fairly and fully, with proof of the influences by which it was produced, its purposes and effect,—it was found guilty, sentenced and is in prison awaiting execution. But this was last November. And even before that it had been tried and condemned. It is an old offender. It was first tried in 1890, when the facts in the case were fresh in the public mind, and was then found guilty. True, a Republican Senate and President could for a while stay proceedings. A little time might be given it for repentance and to prepare for death. But it was in prison then and has been for three years with the condemnation of the country upon it and with the certainty that it must go. Timid manufacturers who really believed that their prosperity was dependent upon it ought to have been shortening sail since 1890.

Let us look a little into the past and see how far the promise or fear of tariff reduction has injured business or caused depression. There has scarcely been a year from the close of the war until 1888 when there has not been promised and impending tariff reduction. The war tariff itself was passed with the pledge that it should be reduced when the necessity for a war revenue was over. Presidents Grant and Arthur and their Secretaries of the Treasury repeatedly recommended such reduction. Some measures in that direction, like the removal of the duty on hides in 1872, were passed. Then the tariff commission of 1882 took up the subject, and after a thorough examination recommended a reduction of duties of from twenty to twenty-five per cent.; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

later, in 1884, the Republican party became very largely in favor of some reduction. Then followed the earnest recommendation of President Cleveland in 1887, and the introduction of the Mills Bill. In all these years there were promise and hope of tariff reduction through both the Republican and Democratic parties, and though these efforts failed—some of them unexpectedly—nowhere did the anticipation of tariff reduction cause panic or business distress. Then came the tariff reform victories of 1890 and 1892, and not for many months after the last was there a panic or business depression. Not until our revenue fell off, and gold was exported, and the gold reserve impaired, and silver purchases enormously increased—all acts directly chargeable to Republican legislation—not until then was confidence destroyed. After that business became stagnant and mills idle. That these were the true causes of the trouble Republicans and Protectionists have admitted. In a recent interview Mr. Thomas Dolan, the well-known protectionist of Philadelphia and of its Manufacturers' Club, said:

"I believe that the depression is almost wholly due to the silver policy. If the alarm was due to the victory of the Democrats, why was it not manifested last November? The people knew then as well as they know now that it was within the power of the new administration to repeal the tariff laws, yet no uneasiness was felt. In fact, in the woollen business everything went along swimmingly until the first of July."

The *American Wool Reporter*, a standard authority, corroborates this statement. It says:

"For those who believe the tariff has been and is the paramount factor in the present depression in the industrial and business world, it may be of interest to note that certain descriptions of wools actually advanced in prices in the spring months—clothing wools were fully one cent per pound higher in March than in January, and some wools two cents per pound higher. If the tariff was a factor it had not made itself manifest in prices during these months. As we have shown in previous issues, the goods market was in good shape, the manufacturers with large orders in hand right through the spring months. The depression is due to a lack of confidence in the stability of our currency."

And no less an authority than Senator Sherman, in the debate in the Senate on October 17, 1893, said:

"If we would try it (repeal of the Sherman act) to-morrow, after all the long debate that has been had, and dispose of this question as we think best for the people of the United States, while you are assuming your responsibility, we would gladden the hearts of millions of laboring men

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who are now being turned out of employment; we would relieve the business cares of thousands of men whose whole fortunes are embarked in trade; we would relieve the farmer and his product for free transportation to foreign countries now clogged for the want of money. In the present condition of affairs there is no money to buy cotton or corn and wheat for foreign consumption. Break down the barrier now maintained by the Senate of the United States, check this viper called obstruction to the will of the majority, give the Senate free power and play, and in ten days from this time the skies will brighten, business will resume its ordinary course, and 'the clouds that lower upon our house will be in the deep bosom of the ocean buried.'"

Let us go a step further and see what the Democratic tariff policy is, and whether it can be an injury or cause of alarm to our industries. Its policy, as often stated, is a revenue tariff with reduction of duties to cheapen the necessaries of life, and give free raw materials to our industries. This it has declared in National and State platforms, formulated into bills and voted for in Congress. This it is pledged to give in its new bill. It means free wool, coal, iron ore and other raw materials, with fair and proper reduction on finished products.

It is something in favor of such a policy that since 1890 it has, after thorough consideration, been twice indorsed by a large majority of our people; that great manufacturing States like New York, New Jersey and Connecticut have constantly supported it, and even Massachusetts voted for it in 1890; that it has been the policy of our nation through most of its life; that, after thorough trial of the low tariff of 1846, manufacturing New England joined with the rest of the country in demanding the lower tariff of 1857, and under these low tariffs many of our great manufacturing cities were founded, and their industries established and prospered. Can such a policy now, after a generation more of active industrial life, with our industries older, with our labor more efficient, with our progress in inventions and greater aptitude for manufacturing, can it, with its assured benefit of free raw material, be a just cause for alarm?

Let us consider some pertinent facts upon this point gathered from the industries themselves, and, first, a bit of evidence from New England. In February, 1889, its iron and steel industries prepared a statement and petition, setting forth their condition and asking Congress for free coal, iron ore and reduced duties on pig and scrap iron. That statement declared that the tendency of these duties had been "to wipe out the iron and steel indus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries, large and small, of New England." It gives the facts to support this claim. Again, it says : "It is then clearly the duty on coal and crude iron that is strangling in New England one of the largest of all the wonderful industries of our moderu days." It adds : "There is no necessity for letting it die ; that it is only the existing duties on coal, ore and crude iron that are strangling it ; and that the abolition of those duties will not only keep it alive, but will insure it a tremendous vitality and large increase."

This statement and petition were signed by 598 iron and steel industries of New England, including almost without exception every one of importance, and by men of both political parties, including the then Republican Governor of Massachusetts. Certainly to that industry there is hope of new life and growth when a Democratic tariff bill takes the place of the McKinley law.

Turn next to the woollen industry. The burden to-day of a duty upon wool is clearly shown by the fact that this industry asks and gets an additional duty on its finished products called compensatory, because given to offset this burden. The industry itself asked Congress in 1866 for free wool, and said that with it a duty of twenty-five per cent. on its finished products was sufficient, and recently over 700 woollen manufacturers and dealers, including some of the largest in the country, have again asked for this benefit. They have no fear that free wool, which in all other civilized countries has been a help to this industry, will here work it harm ; and they remember that since 1888 the Democratic party has twice formulated its policy into bills which gave free wool, still leaving a duty on its product larger than the labor cost of the product and much larger than the twenty-five per cent. asked by the woollen industry in 1866.

Turn next to the boot and shoe and leather industries. What better proof could be given of the benefit of the Democratic policy of free raw materials than the growth and prosperity of those industries after the duty on hides was removed in 1872, and their unanimous protest against the proposition to reimpose that duty by the McKinley Bill ? With their principal raw material free, they export annually over thirteen million dollars worth of goods, competing in the markets of the world with the labor of the world. Mr. McKinley said there was no reason for a duty on wool which did not equally apply to hides. He was right, but he did not put back the duty against this protest. The Demo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic party says that every reason which made hides free demands that wool be free, and it proposes to act upon this belief. The great advantage of free silk to the silk industry, of free rags to the paper industry, of free hides to the boot and shoe and leather industries, can and ought to be extended to other industries as a benefit not only to all the people as consumers, but to the industries themselves, giving them a larger market here and a better chance to send their products into foreign markets.

This is the policy of the Democratic party as declared in its platforms, formulated in its measures and supported by its votes. It advocates a revenue tariff, remembering that revenue has been the basis of every tariff, even our war tariff, until 1888, when another principle, controlling the Republican party, supplanted it and found expression in the McKinley Bill. It believes that a tariff, which gives free raw materials and cheaper necessaries of life and which is required to raise a revenue of nearly two hundred million dollars, is a conservative measure, and a benefit to industries as well as to the people. It does not believe in tariff taxation which has for its purpose and result taking from one to give to another, or burdening all to enrich the few. It opposes the principle of the McKinley Bill that taxation can be laid not for revenue, a public purpose, but solely for private interests, to kill competition, encourage trusts and cut off revenue.

The country deliberately—emphatically—said in 1890 and 1892 that the Democratic policy was right in principle and would be beneficial in its results. It is hardly conceivable that its mature judgment, twice expressed, was wholly wrong. It certainly is no proof of this that a great business depression has come under another tariff policy, which by the same judgment the country condemned and ordered to be repealed.

WILLIAM E. RUSSELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BATTLE-SHIP OF THE FUTURE—A REPLY TO ADMIRAL COLOMB.

BY CAPT. W. T. SAMPSON, U. S. N., CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

A BATTLE-SHIP is that fighting ship which combines in the highest possible degree the powers of offence and defence. This is no new distinction, for in all times the ships which possessed these high qualities, whether propelled by oars, sails, or machinery, have been accorded the honor of bearing the shock of battle when fleets have met. Other vessels intended for special purposes have been always associated with the battle-ships. Never in the history of navies have these auxiliaries been so numerous in proportion to the number of battle-ships, or so various in type, as they are now. We have cruisers large and small, protected cruisers, armored cruisers, rams, commerce-destroyers, gunboats, torpedo cruisers, torpedo boats, etc. Each of these types has its own characteristics, in which speed, the number and size of guns, coal endurance, manœuvring power, etc., are made most prominent, according to the supposed needs of the case. Each is a fighting ship in its way; but none of them, nor all of them acting together, could be expected to meet a battle-ship in a fair fight. Before a fleet of battle-ships a host of these other craft must scurry to cover, or only venture out under protection of darkness.

Attempts are periodically made to magnify the importance of each of these types of auxiliaries. At one time we are told that a fleet of commerce-destroyers would constitute the most efficient naval force for a nation; again, it is a fleet of rams or a sufficient number of torpedo boats. While commerce-destroyers might succeed in driving an enemy's commerce from the seas, Mahan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has shown that this alone is not sufficient to terminate a war, or even to greatly influence the result. A fleet of swift and heavy rams would be able to greatly annoy a smaller number of battle-ships, but they could do little more. Nor could those night-hawks, the torpedo boats, hope to do more than frighten their big enemies, the battle-ships.

It is not intended to assert that rams or torpedo boats could not occasionally destroy a battle-ship, but the circumstances must be very favorable to the smaller craft to admit of such a result. It is not intended in this brief article to attempt to give the reasons for these opinions. They are expressed here only to define and outline by contrast the characteristics of the battle-ship, which embodies in the highest degree in which they can be combined the good qualities of all other fighting ships. She mounts heavy guns to pierce the armor of her enemies; she mounts numerous guns of lighter calibre to enable her to meet similar fire from all sorts of craft and to destroy the quick-moving torpedo boats which would escape the slow-working, heavy guns; she carries armor to protect herself against any but the heaviest projectiles, and, so far as possible, against even these; she carries torpedoes to destroy an enemy who may, in the manœuvres of battle, come within her reach; she carries such a supply of coal and ammunition as will enable her to perform her duty between the times when she can renew her supply. Being essentially a fighting machine, she does not require high speed to enable her to escape from an enemy. When war shall come between any of the great nations which depend in whole or in part upon their naval strength, it will be the battle-ship which will settle the issue. And such, in brief, is the battle-ship of to-day.

But the battle-ship of the future—to predict her design would be to solve at once problems destined for many a year to baffle the skill of the naval architect. If the powder question were settled forever, if the quality of gun steel and the system of manufacture of guns were decided beyond cavil, if the quality of armor had been definitely established, if the strength of projectiles had reached a limit, if the means of attack and defence were to be restricted to those now in use; even were all these elements fixed and unalterable, yet would it be a difficult task to predict the design of the future battle-ship. But, when it is re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

membered that these elements may alter, that they may be modified, that they may even be exchanged for others more suitable, the problem becomes more complex, the solution more difficult. When it is also borne in mind that many other elements of design which are not purely military are likewise liable to change, such as the character of the fuel used, or the whole system of propulsion, the prediction partakes of the nature of prophecy.

A brief glance at the influence which would probably be produced upon the future battle-ship by a modification of each of the elements referred to may assist us in arriving at a conclusion as to the probable influence of all combined. If, at the same time, we glance at the progress or changes which each has undergone during thirty years, which comprehend the period in which the greatest changes have been made, we shall have the important aid of history also to guide us.

We may, for brevity, consider together the gun, its powder and projectile, for, as Admiral Colomb has said, the gun will probably always have a predominating influence in deciding the design of the fighting ship. That battle-ship will best fulfil its mission which carries the most powerful battery the most steadily, with the greatest celerity, from place to place, and to the greatest distance, and in which the stability is best protected.

The power of the gun has enormously increased within the past thirty years. This increase in power is not represented by increase in size, but by the greatly increased velocity which it imparts to a projectile greatly increased in weight. The 15-inch smooth bore guns mounted in our monitors, which may be taken to represent the maximum efficiency of guns in our service thirty years ago, would barely penetrate six inches of iron at the muzzle, while at 1,500 yards the penetration would not exceed $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The 13-inch rifles to be placed in our battle-ships will penetrate 27 inches of steel at the muzzle, or 23 inches at 1,500 yards; at greater distances the difference becomes more marked.

Smokeless powder, whose greatest advantage lies in the high velocity it can impart to the projectile, will probably still further increase the velocity as the powder is developed. This may, and probably will, continue until it becomes necessary to modify the form of the gun and increase the strength of the material. As the slow burning brown powder was a step in advance of the quicker burning black, distributing the pressure more uni-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formly along the bore of the gun, so does the smokeless powder make a decided advance in the same manner, until we now have reached a muzzle velocity which is nearly double what was obtained with the smooth bore thirty years ago, and which, at a distance of 1,500 yards is three times as great as was possible with the old gun. We may expect the mutual reaction of the gun and the powder, as regards development, to continue. Every improvement in the powder will be met by an appropriate modification in the gun, and every increase in the strength of the gun will be utilized by an increase in the pressure of the powder. Thus the energy of the projectile will increase and the difficulty in controlling the recoil of the gun will become greater. When the energy of the projectile was but a few hundred foot tons, it was comparatively easy to restrain the recoil, but when the energy of the projectile rises to 30,000 foot tons, it becomes a far more difficult problem to control the recoil, demanding the use of powerful hydraulic machinery. The necessary protection of this machinery has led to an increase of armor on the ship beyond what was before necessary, and this in turn has demanded a larger ship to carry it.

The increased velocity has made necessary greater strength in the projectile, for those of cast iron are broken to fragments, even against light and soft armor; wrought-iron projectiles are deformed like a leaden bullet ; cast steel is only better than cast iron, but the very highest skill of the metallurgical art has succeeded in producing an armor piercing projectile of wonderful strength, which, under favorable conditions of impact, can transfer nearly its total energy to the opposing armor. Yet in this very matter of projectiles naval artillery is now the weakest. The energy which the gun can impart to the projectile is sufficient to crush the strongest to fragments, even when the armor is soft, if the line of impact is oblique to the armor ; and when the armor is hardened by the Harvey process the projectile is nearly always broken, whatever may be the line of impact. The armor-piercing power of the gun is therefore limited by the strength of the projectile which can be manufactured.

Turning for a moment to the armor itself, we see that since the time when wooden walls were found to be insufficient protection against the increasing energy of the shot, and the introduction of steam engines made more effective protection necessary to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

save the machinery from injury, it has been one prolonged struggle for supremacy between the gun and the armor. For every increase in the power of the gun there was an increase in the thickness of the armor, until the armor became so heavy that its protection had to be limited to a portion of the ship and even then only large ships could carry the weight which was required. Then commenced a decided improvement in the quality of the armor, which has progressed through the vicissitudes of compound armor and all steel armor, and has now developed into alloys of nickel and steel, of chrome, nickel, and steel, and has finally culminated in the Harvey process of hardening the surface of the armor made of the above alloys. This armor, as before stated, defies the best projectile which has yet been produced. The armor has now decidedly the advantage.

It has reached such a stage of development, has attained such a degree of excellence, that it may in future be reduced in thickness 25 per cent. under what was but just now considered necessary. This weight may be saved or expended to increase the protection, the battery power, the speed or the coal endurance. If saved, we shall have a smaller ship, retaining all other characteristics of battery, speed and endurance, but manifestly in no great degree superior to the larger ship carrying thicker armor. Each would have the same protection, battery, speed and endurance. The smaller ship would be considerably less in cost and more economical in maintenance. On the other hand, the saving in weight due to the superior quality of armor may be used to increase the area of the armor, and there will result a ship having all the characteristics of the original, but with better protection.

If additional protection is not considered as desirable as additional power of offence, then the additional weight can be used to increase the number of guns or increase their size. The choice between increase in size or increase of numbers would depend upon whether or not the guns are already large enough for the purpose intended. It would be folly to arm a ship with guns manifestly overmatched by the armor of her enemy. On the other hand, guns which are too large are correspondingly less efficient.

To apply the saving in weight to an increase in speed beyond the present limit of about fifteen to seventeen knots is not per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

missible, nor is it desirable to increase the coal endurance beyond what is necessary to enable the ship to reach and act at the points intended.

To go somewhat more into detail, we see that the design of the fighting ship, in distinction from that of a cruiser, must depend upon the guns which she is to carry. From this single condition, when rightly interpreted and understood, will follow all other requirements. For instance, the guns must have power to overcome the armor of her adversary. Should the adversary make the mistake of encasing herself in such thick armor that she must limit that armor to a comparatively small area, leaving sufficient unprotected to render her a certain prey to moderate guns, then it would not be necessary to attack her armor in order to destroy her. The armor protection then should be so distributed that it must be punctured to fatally injure the ship. It may be stated as a rule that the battle-ship should carry guns that will overmatch, at least under favorable conditions of impact, the armor which she herself carries. This may seem to be reducing all fighting ships to the same level, leaving no advantage with either of two opposing sides. But it must be remembered that, like two opposing armies, the victory will probably rest with the one which can bring the greater number into action.

The oft-repeated proposition to save weight in armor by reducing the freeboard, or, in other words, by making the fighting ship of the monitor type, will not produce the ship of the future. Those who advocate the monitor overlook the fact that the present battle-ship has incorporated the only useful feature of that type, which is the turret. The low freeboard of the monitor is not compatible with the present speed. Considerable height is necessary to keep the bow wave from coming on board the ship. No better illustration of this can be found than in our coast defence vessel, the "Monterey." At her maximum speed of about fourteen knots, the forward part of the vessel is several feet under water, rendering it impossible to make good practice with her forward guns, when running even at less than maximum speed.

Bearing in mind that the following remarks are limited to the battle-ship and recalling her description, we may venture to predict the directions in which this mighty engine of war will be developed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First, It may be stated with confidence that her speed will be quite moderate, not exceeding sixteen or seventeen knots, as a maximum. Undoubtedly there might arise occasions when a higher speed would be of advantage to a fleet in pursuit of a weaker one, or when it would prove invaluable to the weaker one in making her escape ; but these occasions are strategical and not tactical. That is to say, small difference of speed will cut no figure in an actual engagement, nor will superior speed enable the defeated fleet to escape ; for it will be found now, as in the time of sailing fleets, that, after a general engagement, the victors will have the advantage in speed even if they did not before. It will be one of the surest signs of defeat that the vanquished have lost in manœuvring power. The fleet having the highest average speed will have it in its power to avoid an engagement, but it cannot be said with certainty that an advantage in speed will enable a fleet to bring on an engagement. Now, when it is remembered that an increase in speed demands the sacrifice of other qualities which are of vital importance in a fight, I think the limit fixed will prove a safe prediction.

While high speed in a battle-ship is not demanded, economical speed is a very important consideration. It is important that the maximum speed may be depended upon at all times; hence the importance given to the question of sheathing and coppering the bottoms of steel ships to prevent the marine growth and consequent loss of speed. Without going into the merits of sheathing, it is thought that the time is not far distant when some more efficacious method will be found for preventing this marine growth. The advocates of sheathing overlook the fact that it is at best only a partial remedy. The injurious effect of foul bottoms has been brought into prominence by the high speed of recent years. When wooden ships were sheathed and the speed was low, the loss from this cause was far less noticeable, although bottoms were foul.

Second, The coal endurance of the future battle-ship must be determined by the distance at which she may be required to act from her base of supplies. This, in its turn, must be determined by the policy of the nation. Our own country having no distant colonies to defend will maintain but a moderate fleet of battle-ships and only for defensive purposes. A proper defence, however, demands that an enemy shall not be permitted to establish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or maintain a base of supplies on our side of either great ocean. This consideration limits the necessary endurance of our battle-ships to a very moderate amount, but to cover all probable demands it should be fixed at about 5,000 miles at an economical speed. All the reasons for this estimate cannot be stated here.

With the introduction of liquid fuel, this endurance might be reduced. Objections still exist to the use of this fuel, but so desirable is it for naval use that we may count upon the removal of them. The fact that its advantages are not so great for the merchant service has delayed its adoption, and will continue to do so for a time. As soon as a demand for it is created it will be manufactured in necessary quantities. We shall then see our ships receiving their fuel in a few hours instead of requiring days, as is now the case. Subdivision, one of the greatest safeguards against under-water injury, may then be greatly extended.

It is evident that moderate speed and moderate endurance will in themselves require a ship of but moderate displacement. It remains to be seen how other requirements will influence the size of the ship.

Third, The subjects armor and armament are best treated together because they are so interdependent. It has been stated, probably without much consideration, that armor will be abandoned for the same reason that led to its abandonment as a personal protection for the soldier, because it had ceased to protect against the improved weapons of warfare, and the weight of the armor could not be increased. But this condition of things does not seem likely to arise in regard to ships. Aside from this, the armor carried by fighting ships is principally for the protection of the stability and machinery of the ship, rather than the men who man her. If any one is in doubt as to the utility of armor on a battle-ship, let him consider from every imaginable point of view the result of an engagement between two fighting ships of the same displacement, one protected by suitable armor and the other without it. The unarmored ship has the advantage that she can devote the weight given to armor in her adversary to increasing the weight of her armament, increasing her speed, or increasing her endurance. Each of these would be an undoubted advantage, but when we consider these advantages as they bear upon the supreme moment when the ships are engaged in battle, we see that the question of coal endurance is not likely to influ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence the result; for it will depend quite as much upon which has received the most recent supply as upon the actual quantity each can carry in her bunkers.

The advantage of superior speed in battle will consist mainly in ramming and avoiding the ram; but it seems very improbable that an unarmored ship would venture to ram an armored one; if this view be correct, the advantage in superior speed will be limited to that of enabling the unarmored ship to choose her fighting distance. As a very moderate superiority of speed would enable her to do this, it would be best to use a large part of her extra displacement in increasing both the weight of her guns and their number. She would thus, by the superior volume of her fire, have some compensation for her own vulnerability. But whatever increase of weight she could possibly give to her guns would be far more than compensated for by the resistance of the armor of her adversary. The unarmored ship would appear to be left with the overwhelming disadvantage that every blow she received would pierce her through and through. Under such circumstances all her other advantages would disappear. Neither superior speed, endurance nor armament could compensate for lack of protection.

The armor applied to a ship has two distinct objects—first, to protect the stability of the ship, and, second, to protect the machinery contained in the ship; included in the latter is not only the propelling machinery, but more especially, from their otherwise exposed position, the guns and the machinery necessary for working them. Incidentally the armor which protects the guns protects the men stationed at them. The larger the guns, the more extended the appliances for handling them, and, consequently, the more effective the protection required. In other words, where heavy guns are mounted, heavy armor must be used, and both conspire to increase the size of the ship.

The necessity for armor being admitted, it remains to determine where its utility ceases. This brings us face to face with the controversy of small ironclads *versus* large ones. Those who advocate the smaller vessels do so on the ground of economy and in the belief that a number of small vessels, costing less than the price of one battle-ship, would be more than a match for her in battle. A little consideration will, I think, show the fallacy of this contention, for if we assume the same characteristics for both

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the battle-ship and the smaller ironclads, it can be shown that they can be more economically obtained in one structure than when distributed among several. If it is assumed that a number of smaller vessels, with less gun power than the battle-ships, can vanquish her by mere force of numbers, there is no good ground for the assumption. The smaller vessels must collectively be at least equal in this respect to their larger antagonist; they must, also, have equal protection, or they will be at a decided disadvantage. In the days of sailing ships, when the manœuvring power was very restricted and guns were necessarily mounted in broadside, it was possible for a number of small vessels to take such positions with reference to a larger antagonist as to put her quite at their mercy. This is not now the case. A battle-ship, with her battery rightly disposed, would be quite indifferent as to the position assumed by such enemies. On the other hand, in the case under consideration, the smaller vessels would be obliged to take position on the beam of the battle-ship if they hoped to pierce her armor, or they must rely upon destroying her by an attack upon her unarmored parts. Without mentioning the greater steadiness of the battle-ship, it may then be fairly assumed that she would be more than a match for the smaller ironclads, whether cost or gun power be made the basis of comparison.

Where then shall cease the constant tendency to greater size which accompanies increase of gun powder and armor protection? If a large vessel is better than a smaller one, can there be any limit? Several considerations control the dimensions. The great cost is a most potent one. A first class battle-ship costs $5,000,000, and only a first class nation can afford to maintain a fleet of such costly weapons. Certain numbers are required in order that their services may extend over a greater area and consequently the individual size or cost must be limited. The liability to accident increases with the dimensions; in taking the ground, or in collision, the great weight of the battle-ship is her destruction. For our own country a decided limit is fixed by the depth of water in our harbors,—for, manifestly, our battle-ships should be capable of entering our own ports. Doubtless the limit has been reached in the "Iowa," now building. Nor need we fear that our battle-ships of 10,000 or 11,000 tons will be greatly outclassed by anything they will ever encounter.

The battle-ship is, or should be, at every stage of the develop-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of the art of naval warfare, a definite machine; and only such variations from a fixed character should exist as are demanded by her environment; by which is meant the character and extent of the area over which she is intended to act. A battle-ship is intended to meet the enemy and fight to a finish. Numbers will, of course, in most cases determine the result, but this is no argument against the theory that the individual ships should possess in the highest degree attainable the maximum fighting power. And very important it is that the battle-ships of a nation should possess uniformity in speed and manœuvring power. That nation which possesses the most homogeneous line of battle has, other things being equal, a great advantage. So important is this consideration that it would be better to sacrifice some qualities which would be a decided improvement in a new ship rather than depart from the leading characteristics of the other ships with which she must be associated. It is not intended by this to exclude improvements, but they must be important ones to outweigh the advantages of a homogeneous fleet.

In conclusion, I may say that the battle-ship of the future will, like all human contrivances, be of gradual growth, resulting from the adaptation to her use of improvements and discoveries in many branches of science. Under the crucial test of war it may be found that many mistakes have been made. If I should venture to point out one of these, it would be the multiplicity of devices which every branch of physical science has contributed to overcrowd our ships. Not that they do not admirably serve their purpose, but I fear that we, as sailors, are growing to rely upon them, and will be lost when the rude shock of battle breaks our electric wires and disarranges the delicate machinery upon which we now depend in a thousand ways. In the main, however, I venture to think that the battle-ship of to-day has a sound reason for all her principal features, and the type will persist. The stability will continue to be carefully protected by vertical armor. Many of the accidents both in battle and times of peace, to which great ships are liable, will be diminished by the adoption of liquid fuel. The main battery will be mounted in turrets furnishing complete protection to the guns, and, as far as possible, to the machinery for their manipulation, and for the supply of ammunition. The secondary battery will be protected in proportion to its importance, while every gun

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position with its crew will be protected against machine and rapid gun fire. The time will never come when we shall cease to demand higher requirements in the battle-ship. Fortunately all requirements are interchangeable. Armor may be substituted for guns, guns for fuel, so that the saving in one direction may at once be utilized in another. The advent of hard-surfaced armor will demand that the calibre of the main battery be maintained; for until projectiles of greater strength can be produced the only way to overcome Harvey armor is to crush it with an overwhelming blow. In addition to this, it will undoubtedly be found that all armor under the constantly varying angles of impact in battle will furnish greater protection than is considered possible when judged by the result of normal impact on the proving ground. For this reason again, the larger calibre of the gun must be maintained, and this, in its turn, determines the great size of the battle-ship of the future, subject to the restrictions which have been indicated.

W. T. SAMPSON, Captain, U. S. N.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MISSION OF THE POPULIST PARTY.

BY SENATOR WILLIAM ALFRED PEFFER, OF KANSAS.

THE Populist Party is an organized demand that the functions of government shall be exercised only for the mutual benefit of all the people. It asserts that government is useful only to the extent that it serves to advance the common weal. Believing that the public good is paramount to private interests, it protests against the delegation of sovereign powers to private agencies. Its motto is: "Equal rights to all; special privileges to none." Its creed is written in a single line of the Declaration of Independence—"All men are created equal." Devoted to the objects for which the constitution of the United States was adopted, it proposes to "form a more perfect union" by cultivating a national sentiment among the people; to "insure domestic tranquility" by securing to every man and woman what they earn; to "establish justice" by procuring an equitable distribution of the products and profits of labor; to "provide for the common defence" by interesting every citizen in the ownership of his home; to "promote the general welfare" by abolishing class legislation and limiting the government to its proper functions; and to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity" by protecting the producing masses against the spoliation of speculators and usurers.

The Populist claims that the mission of his party is to emancipate labor. He believes that men are not only created equal, but that they are equally entitled to the use of natural resources in procuring means of subsistence and comfort. He believes that an equitable distribution of the products and profits of labor is essential to the highest form of civilization; that taxation should only be for public purposes, and that all moneys raised by taxes should go into the public treasury; that public needs should be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supplied by public agencies, and that the people should be served equally and alike.

The party believes in popular government. Its demands may be summarized fairly to be—

1. An exclusively national currency in amount amply sufficient for all the uses for which money is needed by the people, to consist of gold and silver coined on equal terms, and government paper, each and all legal tender in payment of debts of whatever nature or amount, receivable for taxes and all public dues.

2. That rates of interest for the use of money be reduced to the level of average net profits in productive industries.

3. That the means of public transportation be brought under public control, to the end that carriage shall not cost more than it is reasonably worth, and that charges may be made uniform.

4. That large private land-holdings be discouraged by law.

It is charged against Populists that they favor paternalism in government. This is an error. They only demand that public functions shall be exercised by public agents, and that sovereign powers shall not be delegated to private persons or corporations having only private interests to serve. They would popularize government to the end that it may accomplish the work for which it was established—to serve the people, all the people, not only a few.

If it be paternalism to require the government to look after any of the private interests of the people, why do we not drive from our grounds as a tramp the postman who delivers our mail? If it be paternalism to bring our transportation business under public control, why do we not repeal the inter-State commerce law and restore the carrying trade to private citizens from whose rapacity the people were partially released some years ago? If it be paternalism to establish government agencies to supply currency to the people, what means the national bank act whose title reads: "An act to provide a national currency secured by a pledge of United States bonds, and to provide for the circulation and redemption thereof?"

All there is in the charge of paternalism lies in the fact that Populists believe that, as to these particular matters, the people would be served, more equitably and at greatly reduced expense, by public agents working on fixed salaries, than by private persons who use their business for private ends.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It will be observed that the party deals with live issues only, and they are those chiefly which relate to the use of natural resources of subsistence and to the distribution of property and property values. This is the only party that clearly expresses a well-defined position on the "money question." It states the kind of money the party wants—gold, silver and paper; it demands that the metals be coined freely, in unlimited quantities, at a ratio of 16 to 1; that the currency shall be issued by the general government only—not by banks—and that it shall be a full legal tender.

To the financial part of the platform it is objected—

1. That the volume of currency required in a given community or State is an unknown quantity, that too much is worse than too little, and that, therefore, it is always better to be within rather than without the proper limit.

2. That paper money cannot safely be issued except on a specie basis, and that the issue ought not to exceed three or four dollars to one dollar of the coin reserve.

3. That no more silver should be coined unless, through international agreement, the principal commercial nations agree to use silver coin at an agreed ratio to gold.

4. That gold is the only proper and safe money material, because its commercial value is always equal to its coin value, and therefore it is the "money of the world."

To the first objection the Populist answers that it is no more difficult to ascertain how much money is required by the people than it is to find out how much of any staple article they need. In normal conditions there is a normal demand for things, and the demand indicates the number, quantity or amount required. Our Treasury officials, in their annual reports, place stress on the need of a more "flexible" currency to meet increased demands which appear periodically—and especially when farmers' crops are to be moved. Bankers complain of scarcity of money at particular seasons. They discover the scarcity because of a demand which they are unable to supply. People make known their need of money in much the same way that they let their need of anything else be known—by asking for it, offering to buy or desiring to borrow or hire it. If it be suggested that the demand might be so great that to supply it would be to derange values, disturb business and bankrupt the people, it is answered that in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

normal conditions men do not purchase more of anything than they need. Why should they buy more money than they need? If they did the excess would advantage them nothing; it would be utterly useless, as all idle money is useless. Populists do not demand an unlimited supply of currency, they ask only for enough; and as an indication of what, from their present information, they regard as a fair limit, they place the amount at not less than fifty dollars per capita, and that is less than we had once when we had none too much.

Answering the second objection, there is no need of an exclusively specie basis for money. That doctrine is a legacy of the dark ages; it had its origin in barbarism. The proper basis for money is property—property that the people produce and of which they have a surplus to exchange for other commodities, and this includes gold and silver.

Hon. John Davis, a distinguished Populist, thus defines certain essential prerequisites to a good currency:

> "First, there must be a regularly established government, as the issuing of money is an act of sovereignty. The said government must be in practical operation, collecting and disbursing revenues and performing the usual monetary functions of a civilized government. Then the money, when issued, must be receivable in the revenues of the issuing government, and it must possess the quality of legal tender. The quantity of the money issued must be in reasonable proportion to the revenues collected; and the material of the money must be fashioned and executed in the highest style of art, above the arts of the counterfeiters."

Value is indefinable, yet everybody understands its meaning. It is an ideal thing, though we all speak of it as if it were a definite quantity. Let a given number and quantity of surplus products of a community be collected and compared with respect to the amount of human labor expended in their production, and find some one article whose value alone, divided or multiplied, is a common divisor of the values of the rest, and you have a unit of value. To illustrate: Take, say, a bushel of wheat; divided into tenths, one-tenth will measure the value of one pound of cotton; divided into hundredths, one-hundredth will measure the value of one pound of salt; entire it will measure the value of a pig; multiplied by twenty-five, it will measure the value of a cow; multiplied by seventy-five it will measure the value of a horse; and so on as to the value of all other articles. Here we have a common measure of value—a bushel of wheat. What, then, let us inquire, is the value

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a bushel of wheat? Why, what it will purchase of other articles in the open market. Of course there will be fluctuations in quantity produced from year to year, the demand will not always be the same, many circumstances will operate to vary prices; still, for common convenience we use a bushel of wheat for the common measure. But wheat, and especially a bushel of it, is an unwieldy thing to use in making exchanges, in paying debts and the like. Let us give a name to the value of a bushel of wheat—what we all understand the value to be, though we cannot define it—and then agree on some small, light, convenient article of manufacture to represent that value. Say we use the word dollar as a name or title to represent the value of the wheat measure, and let us make the representative out of silver or aluminum or paper, and use that for money in place of wheat. We use silver dollars now, and paper dollars, and the foregoing illustration explains their relation to other things. The intrinsic value of the two dollar pieces is not the same; that is to say, the commercial value of the materials of which they are made is greater in one than in the other, but the money value of each is exactly the same. Value resides in the property dealt in, and not necessarily in the money pieces which pay for it. A paper dollar is quite as good to buy sugar with as a dollar made of gold or silver. Intrinsic value in money coins is a delusion. The doctrine of equivalents is impossible of application now. Whatever value money has the law gives it. Legal tender is a legal function imparted by the sovereign power of the people for their convenience in transacting their business.

But, if we should agree that a "specie basis" is necessary, our own experience proves that a much larger amount of paper than three to four dollars can be floated on one dollar of gold reserve. Our national bank circulation is now about $180,000,000. It is redeemable in United States notes, of which there is $346,000,000 out, and that is all redeemable in gold. Treasury notes issued in payment for silver bullion amounts to, say, $156,000,000, all payable in gold, so the department holds. These several sums, amounting to nearly $700,000,000, are all redeemable in gold, and we have only $100,000,000 provided for that purpose—one dollar in gold to float seven dollars in paper.

Answering the third objection, it is urged that silver is quite as good as gold for use in money coins, and that both metals

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ought to be so used if one of them is, so as to divide between them the money work to be performed. The base will be more ample with both than with one, the average fluctuation in bullion values will be less, and a fair general level of prices of other commodities will be more easily maintained. We ought to coin both metals freely, or, if we discard one, then in order to prevent undue falling of prices by reason of the increasing value of the other, it will be better to discard that also, and resort to the use of some other suitable material of little value to make our money coins out of. The talk about maintaining parity between the values of metals, unless both are wholly monopolized by the government, is silly; but to maintain parity between the value of money coins is easily done if the law does not discriminate against any of them. We always maintained coin parity when we minted gold and silver on equal terms, and we have done so twenty years—since 1873—with a constantly increasing stock of silver, and with limited coinage. It is the law that maintains parity among values of money pieces, not the market price of the material of which they are made. Government cannot regulate prices of articles sold and bought in the open market; but it can regulate the value of money. It is true that when a marketable commodity of considerable value is used for money coins, traders, bankers, and speculators, by dealing in the commodity, may run prices up or down at their pleasure and thus derange values generally, create "corners," and force panics.

As matter of fact the people use very little coin. To ascertain the proportions of different kinds of money circulating, the Comptroller of the Currency procured statements from 3,364 national banks for the first day of July, 1890, and from 3,474 banks for September 17th of the same year; and from these reports it appeared that of the total receipts of $421,824,726 on the first day named, and $327,278,251 on the second day—a grand total of $748,102,977 for both days—the "cash" receipts were but 8.96 per cent., and 91.04 per cent. was in "checks, drafts, and other substitutes for money." Of the first day's receipts, .89 per cent. was in gold coin and .32 per cent. in silver coin—1.21 per cent. in both. Of the second day's receipts, 1.13 per cent. was in gold coin and .43 per cent. in silver coin—1.56 per cent. in both. If we use so little coin, why all this fuss about it? A busy, productive, prosperous people like ours can always get gold

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for their wheat and cotton as long as people who want wheat and cotton have gold to pay for them.

Answering the fourth objection, the commercial value of gold bullion is largely dependent upon its value for coinage. The value of the gold coin now in the world is estimated at nearly $4,000,000,000, the accumulation of many centuries. Gold is practically indestructible. If this vast amount were demonetized and thrown on the market, its value, pound for pound, would fall quite as low as that of silver bullion now. But, aside from this consideration, there is not gold enough in the world nor in this country, nor in any other, to perform the necessary money functions only, at the expense of all other property values. There is gold enough if we are content with wheat at fifty cents a bushel and cotton at five cents a pound, with a constant lowering of the general level of prices; and that is what a permanent gold basis means.

The doctrine was well stated by the Royal Commission, in their "Bullion Report," eighty-three years ago: "The amount of gold in the world will suffice to perform the exchanges of the world. If these be more or less, it would only affect the average level of prices the world over."

The assessed valuation of the taxable property of the people of the United States is about $24,000,000,000, the estimated value being put at about two and one-half times that amount, or say $60,000,000,000. A large part of this, of course, represents real estate and other fixed property that does not often change hands, and therefore but little active money is required to handle it. But the value of our internal commerce has grown to an almost inconceivably large amount. In 1877 it was equal to twenty-five times the value of our total foreign commerce; and if the same rate of progress has continued to the present—and there is no reason to doubt that it has—our trade among ourselves is not less than $45,000,000,000. And this does not include any portion of the vast aggregate of local traffic among the people at their home market towns. Nor does it include banking business, nor that of insurance companies and loan agents. It is within reasonable bounds to say that the people of the United States now transact a business among themselves, which requires the constant use of ready money, equal to $100,000,000,000 annually. Yet the Treasury officials say that our total stock of money is but little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over $1,600,000,000, and nearly half of that is in Treasury and bank vaults, held as reserves—not in use at all. When we add to the amount of these reserves the moneys kept in the treasuries of State and municipal officers, and the errors in estimates of gold in the country, the free money—that which is always available for use in business—is found to be not in excees of $600,000,000, or less than $10 per capita; and at the late extraordinary session of Congress an annual increase of about $50,000,000 was cut off. Of the gold coin supposed to be in the country a reserve fund of $100,000,000 is kept in the United States Treasury, leaving but $400,000,000 to "perform the exchanges" of a great and growing people, doing a business among themselves amounting to $100,000,000,000, a sum two hundred and fifty times as large as our stock of available gold.

To say that, in the absence of coin, paper cannot be made good money is to deny our own experience. The people of the United States have been using little else than paper money during all of the last thirty-two years, though we have been on a gold basis, and no man has lost a dollar by its use. Our losses have come from its having been taken away from us, and funded in coin bonds, increasing our debts and depriving us in large measure of the means of payment. The depreciation of property values by a rapid withdrawal of government paper, from 1865 to 1869, cost the country more than the great war.

The Populist party is the only party that honestly favors good money. Democrats and Republicans alike declare their purpose to make all dollars equally good and to maintain the parity between them, and the recent act of Congress repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman law contains a similar declaration; but when an amendment was proposed to the bill in the Senate to make good the platform promises by incorporating them in the law, there were not enough Senators in favor of it to secure a yea and nay vote on the amendment. We have seven different kinds of money, and only one of them is good, according to the determination of the Treasury officials. Bank notes are not legal tender, neither are silver certificates, nor gold certificates. Treasury notes are not legal tender in cases where another kind of money is expressed in the contract, and United States notes (greenbacks) will not pay either principal or interest on any government bond. None of our paper

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

money is taxable. Silver dollars are by law full legal tender in payment of debts to any amount whatever, but the Treasury does not pay them out on any obligation unless they are specially requested. In practice, we have but one full legal tender money—gold coin; and Republicans and Democrats are agreed on continuing that policy; while Populists demand gold, silver, and paper money, all equally full legal tender.

The fact that we have now out about $700,000,000 in paper is proof that our stock of coin is utterly inadequate to perform all the money duty required in the people's business transactions. The discontinuance of silver coinage stops the supply from that source. It is believed by men best informed on the subject that the gold used in the arts has reached an amount about equal to the annual output of the mines. Then the world's stock of gold coin will not be increased unless the arts are drawn upon, and that can be done successfully only at a price above the money value of the coin. Russia, Austria, Italy, and the United States all want more gold. Where is it to come from? And what will it cost the purchaser? Are we to drop back to Roman methods of procuring treasure? When all the nations set out on gold hunting expeditions, who will be the victor and what will become of the spoils?

It is evident that we must have more money, and Congress alone is authorized to prepare it. States are prohibited by the Constitution of the United States from making anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts, and nothing is money that is not a tender. The people can rely only on Congress for a safe circulating medium.

Populists demand not only a sufficiency of money, but a reduction of interest rates at least as low as the general level of the people's savings. They aver that with interest at present legal and actual rates, an increase in the volume of money in the country would be of little permanent benefit, for bankers and brokers would control its circulation, just as they do now. But with interest charges reduced to three or two per cent. the business of the money-lender would be no more profitable than that of the farmer—and why should it be?

It is strange that most people have not yet discovered the destroying power of interest. Let us take two examples—Massachusetts and the United States. In 1790 the taxable property

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Massachusetts was given at $44,024,349. If that amount—$44,000,000 in round numbers—had been put at interest then (1790) at six per cent., compounded annually, and continued to 1890—one hundred years—it would have amounted to $14,937,461,615. The taxable property of Massachusetts in 1890 was valued at $2,154,134,626—a little more than one-seventh part of the amount which the State's value one hundred years before would have amounted to in the same length of time at six per cent. interest compounded annually. The property valuation of the United States in 1790 was estimated to be $619,977,247. If that sum had then been put at interest at six per cent. and continued to 1890—one hundred years—compounded annually, it would have amounted to $210,358,279,907. The estimated value of our property in 1890 was about $60,000,000,000, but little more than one-fourth of what our value one hundred years before would have amounted to at six per cent. interest for the same time, compounded annually. It appears that a six per cent. rate of interest would have accumulated in one hundred years $12,783,326,989, more than the people of Massachusetts, with all their advantages, were able to save during the same time out of their combined labor and its profits. It further appears that the same rate of interest would have accumulated $150,000,000,000 more in one hundred years than the people of the United States, with all their acquisitions of new territory, were able to save out of their labor and its profits in the same time. We have been paying six to twelve per cent. annual interest—often much higher—when we have not saved out of our combined earnings as much as four per cent. This explains how the wealth of the country is being so rapidly transferred from the people who produced it to those who did not. It is passing through the interest channel. The rate of interest ought to be regulated by the general level of net profits in productive industry and kept at a figure which men engaged in usual vocations can afford to pay, return the principal, and save the property purchased with the money hired. To illustrate: John engages to buy a farm, and borrows money to pay for it, or purchases on time, which is the same thing. The rate of interest ought to be what, with prudent management through a reasonable number of average seasons, he can pay yearly, with part of the principal, until he has paid out and has the farm left.

Three per cent. compounded annually is a fair average the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world over for labor's saving. It has been a little more in the United States, but a gold basis will soon bring us to the general level, and that will settle lower as population and trade increase.

While the Populist party favors government ownership and control of railroads, it wisely leaves for future consideration the means by which such ownership and control can best be brought about. The conditions which seem to make necessary such a change in our transportation system preclude all probability of its ever being practicable, if it were desirable, to purchase existing railway lines. The total capitalization of railroads in the United States in 1890 was put at $9,871,378,389—nearly ten thousand million dollars. It would be putting the figures high to say that the roads are worth one-half the amount of their capital stock. This leaves a fictitious value of $5,000,000,000 which the people must maintain for the roads by transportation charges twice as high as they would be if the capitalization were only half as much. It is the excessive capitalization which the people have to maintain that they complain about. It would be an unbusinesslike proceeding for the people to purchase roads when they could build better ones just where and when they are needed for less than half the money that would be required to clear these companies' books. It is conceded that none of the highly capitalized railroad corporations expect to pay their debts. If they can keep even on interest account, they do well, and that is all they are trying to do. While charges have been greatly reduced, they are still based on capitalization, and courts have held that the companies are entitled to reasonable profits on their investment. The people have but one safe remedy—to construct their own roads as needed, and then they will "own and control" them.

This is not a new doctrine. A select committee of the Senate of the United States, at the head of which was Hon. William Windom, then a Senator and afterward Secretary of the Treasury appointed in December, 1872, reported among other recommendations one proposing the construction of a "government freight railway," for the purpose of effectively regulating interstate commerce. A government freight railway would have no capitalization, no debt, bonded or otherwise; its charges would be only what it would cost to handle the traffic and keep the road in repair. That would reduce cost of carriage to a minimum, and nothing else will.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Populists complain of legislation in the interest of favored classes. At the very time when the homestead law was passed a scheme was hatching to absorb the public lands by railway corporations. Scarcely had the great war begun when a plan was laid to establish a system of national banking based on the people's debts; and while customs duties were raised to increase the public revenues, cheap foreign labor was brought in under contract to man the factories. Banks have been specially favored. When it was to their interest to withdraw their notes it was done with impunity. They have been permitted to openly violate the law which authorizes their existence, and this without rebuke. The United States Senate shields them from exposure. When the Treasury was flush, public moneys were lavishly left with the banks to use without interest, and when the great banks in New York city needed funds to relieve the stringency in the "money market" there, they had only to ask and they received. And now that the Treasury is running short in gold reserves, there is a demand for more bonds to purchase more gold to be used in redeeming Treasury notes which the law requires to be redeemed in silver, thus again reducing the reserves, making another bond issue necessary to procure more gold; and so on, as the "money market" may require. These "Napoleons of Finance" are playing a bold game.

Since 1879, a period of fourteen years, the banks have had free use of an annual average of $18,000,000 of the public moneys. This they have used to lend to their patrons at an average rate not less than ten per cent., while at the same time drawing four per cent. or four and one-half per cent. from the Government on bonds deposited as security for the money left with them, as the following statement shows:

STATEMENT SHOWING AMOUNT OF THE BALANCE OF PUBLIC MONEYS HELD BY THE NATIONAL BANK DEPOSITORIES AT THE CLOSE OF BUSINESS JUNE 30 OF EACH YEAR SINCE AND INCLUDING 1879 IS AS FOLLOWS:

1879	$7,183,403.42	1887	$19,190,076.79
1880	7,999,953.86	1888	54,913,489.74
1881	8,933,550.79	1889	43,305 511.91
1882	9,610.432.86	1890	26,994.461.70
1883	10,030,698.33	1891	22,900,329.65
1884	10.716,144.17	1892	12.559,446.61
1885	10,985,141.34	1893	12,393,071.11
1886	14,036,632.18		

No amount of interest has been paid by national bank depositories for the use of the public moneys deposited therewith.

If farmers had asked for the use of that money and offered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their farms as security for repayment, they would have learned that the law was not made for their benefit.

Since 1880, premium has been paid on Government bonds by the Treasury Department amounting in the aggregate to $60,125,218.98, as the following statement shows :

STATEMENT SHOWING AMOUNT OF PREMIUM PAID ON GOVERNMENT BONDS SINCE AND INCLUDING THE YEAR 1880.

Year.	Amount.	Year.	Amount.
1880	$2,795,320.42	1890	$20,304,224.06
1881	1,061,248.78	1891	10,401,220.61
1888	8,270,842.46		
1889	17,292,362.65	Total	$60,125,218.98

Nearly all that gratuity to bondholders was bestowed during years of great depression and hardship among other classes of people.

The Treasury has been in the habit of advancing interest on bonds six months to nine months before it was due. This was done ostensibly in the public interest, but the bondholder was the only person that profited by the transaction. The following statement shows how much of the people's money went that way since 1880.

STATEMENT SHOWING AMOUNT OF MONEY ADVANCED BY THE TREASURY FOR INTEREST NOT DUE ON GOVERNMENT BONDS SINCE AND INCLUDING THE YEAR 1881.

Year.	Amount.	Year.	Amount.
1881	$3,091,947.07	1887	$8,735,743.23
1882	11,166,900.21	1888	15,904,117.50
1883	3,93[illegible],726.00	1891	13,229,726.50
1884	220,969.62	1892	5,364,086.80
		From July 1, 1893, to Oct. 1, 1893	5,002,666.15
		Total	$66,697,883.08

The use of $66,000,000 for six months at the rate of five per cent. per annum is $3,300,000—money enough to pay the wages of a thousand workingmen a year at present rates.

Rapid accumulation of wealth by a few citizens, as we have seen it in the United States during the last thirty years, is evidence of morbidly abnormal conditions. It is inconsistent with free institutions. It is breeding anarchy and trouble. No man can honestly take to himself what he does not earn ; and if he does no more than that, riches will come to him slowly. It is only when he gets what he does not earn that his "success" attracts attention. Fortunes running into millions of dollars must be made up of property and profits mostly produced and earned by persons other than those who claim them.

No man ever earned a million dollars. If he was moved to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great undertakings, nature's God inspired him. And if, in the play of his ambition he marshalled effective forces, his equipment cost him little. To a great mind success is compensation. The value of its labor cannot be measured with money. A strong man's intellect moves as easily as a blacksmith's arm. Both are gifts.

The best men are content with little. Vast enterprises which move the world are maintained by contributions from the labor of the poor. Leaders do but organize and direct; the rank and file do all the rest. Apply the "iron law of wages" equally to all that work and you scale down the salaries of many useless people. If the Republic is to endure we must encourage the average man.

W. A. PEFFER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARE OUR PATENT LAWS INIQUITOUS?

BY THE HON. W. E. SIMONDS, EX-COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

Is IT wrong in itself or hurtful to the national prosperity for the grain-raisers of the West to plant the seed and till the ground? Is it wrong to permit those grain-raisers to own and sell the products of their toil? These two questions are less unreasonable than the one which heads this article.

The inventor holds his property by two distinct and impregnable titles. It is his because of his natural right to it, and also because the public welfare—formulating its need and will in the Constitution and statutes—demands that it shall be his. Various kinds of natural rights exist independently of statute, because they are instinctively recognized by all men who are wholly sane. Our Declaration of Independence is explicitly based upon natural rights. Its second sentence is this: "We hold these truths to be self evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." The "pursuit of happiness' meant in large part the undisturbed possession of property; the colonies were suffering from "taxation without representation." Among other natural rights, Blackstone catalogues the natural right of property thus: "The third absolute right inherent in every Englishman is that of property."

This recognition of natural right in property is not confined to civilization; if an Indian fashions a bow from a sapling that he cuts, or a garment from the skin of a beast that he kills, his fellows instinctively recognize his right of property therein. Anything capable of reduction to possession and having value in exchange is property-subject-matter. No higher title to an exclusive right in an article of property is imaginable than that which springs from making it out of materials belonging to no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one else. An invention is the visible expression of a mental conception; it is capable of reduction to possession, and has value in exchange, wherefore it is property-subject-matter; the inventor makes it out of materials belonging to no one else, wherefore it is his property by natural right and by the high title of creation.

Let us pause to understand what the possession of the invention means. The invention is the visible expression of a mental conception; its value does not reside in the intrinsic worth of the wood, or iron, or brass by the use of which the mental conception is made manifest; it resides in the visible expression of the mental conception itself; the inventor must have dominion of that; no one must be permitted to appropriate the inventor's idea without his consent; otherwise he does not retain possession of his invention.

The inventor's property is not a monopoly in any other sense than is the ownership of a house. Blackstone properly defines monopoly as "a license or privilege whereby the public in general is restricted from the liberty of manufacturing or trading which he had before." The inventor does not deprive his fellow man of any right he had before. His invention, in order to be an invention, must be something new. A patent can only be had for something new. Monopoly works a deprivation to the public. Invention adds to the stock of public possessions.

So much for an inventor's title to his property as a matter of natural right. Now as to his ownership "because the public welfare demands that it shall be his." It was precisely on that ground that the builders of the Constitution authorized the granting of patents. They were seeking to benefit the public, not to reward inventors. Their motive was enlightened selfishness. "In order to promote the progress of science and useful arts" they authorized Congress "to secure for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." The first Congress enacted a patent law in 1790, and there has been one ever since. The first year there were three patents granted; the last year, 1892, there were forty thousand applied for, twenty-three thousand granted, and the revenue therefrom was more than $1,200,000, being $175,000 in excess of expenses, which was added to the $4,000,000 already in the treasury to the credit of the Patent Office. Numerically and financially our patent law is beyond question a success.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Has it promoted the progress of science and the useful arts? The growth of our manufactures is the marvel of the ages, and the percentage thereof not originally based upon, or at some time vigorously stimulated by, some invention recorded in the Patent Office is a small one. The following are a few and only a few of the American inventors whose reputation has become national and whose improvements have formed the foundation of manufacturing industries of great magnitude: John Fitch, Robert Fulton, and James Rumsey, as to steamboats; Eli Whitney, as to the cotton-gin; Oliver Evans, as to milling-machinery; Amos Whittemore, Erastus B. Bigelow, and Barton H. Jenks, as to looms; Eli Terry, Ira Ives, Noble Jerome, and Chauncey Jerome, as to clocks; Peter Lorillard, as to tobacco making; E. I. Du Pont de Nemours, as to gunpowder; Jesse Reed, as to nail-making; William Edwards, as to leather-making; Jethro Wood, as to iron plows; Thomas Blanchard, as to lathes for turning irregular forms; Asa Spencer, as to geometrical lathes; Richard M. Hoe, Isaac Adams, Stephen P. Ruggles, Andrew Campbell, Moses S. Beach, and G. P. Gordon, as to printing-presses; Samuel W. Collins and Elisha K. Root, as to axe-making; Oliver Ames, as to shovels; William Woodworth, as to wood-working; Thaddeus Fairbanks, as to scales; John J. Howe and Chauncey O. Crosby, as to pin-making; Eliphalet Nott and Jordon L. Mott, as to stoves; Robert L. and Alexander Stuart, as to sugar-refining; Matthew W. Baldwin and Ross Winans, as to locomotives; Cyrus H. McCormick and William P. Ketchum, as to mowing and reaping; Samuel Colt, Ethan Allen, Christian Sharps, Edmund Maynard, Rollin White, Christopher M. Spencer, Horace Smith, and Daniel P. Wesson, as to fire-arms; Alonzo D. Phillips, as to friction-matches; Henry A. Wells, as to hat making; Charles Goodyear, Nathaniel Hayward, and Horace H. Day, as to India-rubber; John Ericsson, as to naval construction and hot-air engines; Elias Howe, Jr., Allen B. Wilson, Isaac Singer, J. E. A. Gibbs, William O. Grover, and William E. Baker, as to sewing-machines; S. F. B. Morse, Royal E. House, and David E. Hughes, as to telegraphs; Henry B. Tatham, as to lead pipe; Cullen Whipple, as to wood-screws; Jonas Chickering and Henry Steinway, Jr., as to pianos; Henry Burden, as to horse-shoe machinery; Linus Yale, as to locks; John A. Roebling, as to cables, chains, and bridges; George H. Corliss, as to steam-en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gines; Asa Whitney and Nathan Washburn, as to car-wheels; Gail Borden, Jr., as to condensed milk; William and Coleman Sellers, as to shafting and iron-working; Henry Disston, as to saws; James J. Mapes, as to fertilizers; John Stephenson, as to horse-cars; R. P. Parrott, as to cannon; Richard J. Gatling, as to Gatling guns.

This list is confined to those inventors whose patents have expired, and whose inventions are now public property. In a short time the list will be augmented by the telephone and the electric light.

This list affords simply a hint of the variety and extent of American inventions. The whole number of patents granted prior to January 1, 1893, was half a million, and the proportion thereof which has been of practical value is vastly larger than the public dreams. Men in general hear only of great inventions, the cotton-gin, the telegraph, the air-brake, the sewing machine, the telephone and the electric light, those which dominate the markets and the mind of the world; they take little note of the tens of thousands of minor inventions, whose aggregated value is far greater than that of the phenomenal improvements which blaze like meteors before the public eye.

In the State of Connecticut lies the Naugatuck Valley, named from the river that courses through it; it is about fifty miles long, with the borough of Winstead at its head, and Long Island Sound at its foot. The valley is cradled between two ranges of barren hillsides; except for slight strips of land along the water course it is hardly worth the settlement. Yet, if a rill of liquid gold ran down the river bed it would not deposit at the valley foot at the year's end so much of wealth as the valley now produces. Boroughs, villages, hamlets and a city are strung along the valley in practical continuity, and all are filled with manufacturing industries built upon patented improvements. The variety of productions would fill a book in their description. Among them are textiles, scythes, edge tools, coffin trimmings, pins, needles, hooks and eyes, clocks, silverware, plated ware, photographic instruments and materials, telegraphic instruments and wire, furniture, miscellaneous hardware, goods of brass and copper in endless variety, and so on. Yankee enterprise, availing itself of patented inventions, has given this barren valley a wealth-producing capacity worthy the envy of Crœsus. And this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is only a sample of the instances which are almost countless in the country taken as a whole. It is gratifying to know that this wonder-working influence is operative here and there, even in the sunny South.

The settlement and cultivation of the great West have only been made possible through patented inventions. Banish our agricultural inventions, and the entire population of the United States, men, women and children, would not suffice to raise and care for half of our present crops. It was Whitney's improvements in cotton-gins that made cotton into a king; we produced three billion six hundred and twenty-two million pounds of that staple in 1889, and without patented inventions it would have required the labor of three millions of men for twelve months simply to clean it. In that same year we produced two billion bushels of corn; destroy patented inventions used in its production, and it would have taken the labor of the twenty-four millions of men and boys that are in the land to plant and harvest it. Meanwhile, where should we have found the labor for the four hundred and ninety million bushels of wheat and the seven hundred and fifty million bushels of oats we raised that year, even if we had managed to do without potatoes and other vegetables? Under the old order of things the value of each bushel of this grain would have been consumed in carting it from Omaha to Chicago, while now it is carried across a continent and then across an ocean, and still sold at a living profit. Right there it is just as well for the farmer to know that competent persons believe that except for patented improvements in compound marine engines, lessening the cost of ocean transportation, his grain could not to-day be laid down in Europe at a price which would permit him to undersell his foreign competitors.

And now, what is the influence of patents on the fortunes of mechanics? We should not have had more than half our present manufacturing industries but for patented inventions, nor employment for more than half our present force of manufacturing mechanics. No delusion is more surely a delusion than the somewhat common one that inventions lessen the wages and the numbers of manual laborers. The same kind of mechanics that now gets two dollars and fifty cents per day received not more than one-half that wage in 1843. At the meeting of the American Social Science Association in 1878 a member read a paper to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the effect that a single great daily newspaper in New York, using modern machinery, had practically displaced five thousand printers using the press of Benjamin Franklin. He forgot the perfectly apparent fact that the wages of this army, if employed, would so enhance the cost of the paper as to destroy the enterprise. Every calculation like his has the fatal defect of forgetting the sure relation between lessened price and increased consumption. No modern volume of business can be done in the ancient way. It must be done in the new way, or not be done at all.

Possibly the sewing machine is the greatest labor-saving device ever known. It is related of Walter Hunt that in 1838 he had nearly completed his invention thereof; that his wife bewailed its effect upon the fortunes of tailors and seamstresses, and that thereupon he gave it over to forgetfulness. Nevertheless it was introduced into public use between 1850 and 1870. In 1850 there was one tailor to four hundred and forty-two inhabitants; in 1870 there was one tailor to three hundred and fifty-eight inhabitants; in that twenty years population increased sixty-five per cent., but the number of tailors had increased more than one hundred per cent. Meanwhile the manufacture and sale of sewing machines gave employment to many thousands of mechanics, and millions of the machines went into use in factories and families. The locomotive is another great labor-saver, which was made common in America between 1850 and 1870, but while in those two decades population increased sixty-five per cent. the makers of carriages and wagons increased more than two hundred per cent.

The plea of him who objects to patents, when plainly stated, is that inventors invent, as birds sing, because they must, and if they were not permitted to have the exclusive right for a little time the public could have the use of their improvements from the beginning. Inventors do not invent because they must; they are actuated by the ordinary motives of human nature—they invent for a livelihood and for remuneration. The "must" argument was ventilated before a British parliamentary commission, and a host of inventors, with Bessemer at their head, promptly appeared and put a quietus upon that notion. Take away the inventor's inducement to invent, and you kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

And if it were true that inventors invent, as birds sing, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

objector's difficulty would be only half overcome. The patent laws are necessary in order to induce capital to take the risk of commercially developing inventions. If to-day, for the first time, an inventor were to produce the sewing machine, that inventor would hawk it up and down the line in vain to find the foolish capitalist who would risk $200,000 upon its commercial development, with the certainty that success would but invite ruinous competition. The history of American carpet-making is instructive upon this point, and also in showing how inventions reduce prices in the long run. A generation ago our carpets were nearly all made for us by foreign hands, and the prices were excessive; a great American inventor produced the Bigelow carpet loom; two and a-half millions of dollars were ventured upon it by the Lowell and Hartford companies. To-day the prices of carpets are less than half what they were, and we import less than one per cent. of the carpets that we use. Without the patent law, these millions would never have been risked upon this wonderfully fruitful experiment.

That portion of the public which thinks itself aggrieved by the patent system points at four patented improvements out of the half million as specific objects of complaint: barbed wire, driven wells, Bell's telephone and Berliner's improvement thereon. It has no just grievance against the barbed wire patents; that invention has proved of enormous value to the public, especially in treeless regions; the complaint is based upon an unwillingness to allow the inventors a minute remuneration for their contribution to the public weal. The complaint against the driven-well patents should be directed against the pirates who knowingly led innocent users into infringement; those users could have avoided trouble if they had acted with the caution and sagacity they ordinarily used in other business matters. The Bell invention deserved the princely recompense it has received; it will be open to the public after January 30, 1894. The complaint in the Berliner case is that the application for the patent was delayed for a long term of years in the Patent Office, during which it should have been running towards expiration. The patent laws were not at fault; they were *abused*. Let the abuse be brought home to the right party, in the suit now pending to repeal that patent. Let us add to the patent laws in two particulars: First, by providing that no innocent user of a patented "manufacture"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or "composition of matter" shall be sued for infringement so long as the maker or seller can be reached; and, Second, by providing that a patent shall begin to run not later than three years from and after the first application therefor. But let it never be said that the agency which has been the most potent of any in the development of our magnificent material prosperity is iniquitous.

W. E. SIMONDS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT DREAMS ARE MADE OF.

BY DR. LOUIS ROBINSON.

THE difficulties in investigating the phenomena of sleep by those experimental methods which have done so much in advancing our physiological knowledge in other directions are obvious. The condition is so unstable that the least interference changes or destroys it, so that the physiologist is in somewhat the same position as a chemist who tries to analyse a substance in which the constituent elements are so loosely connected as to fly apart at a touch. The chemist, however, has this advantage, viz., that when his problematical material is disintegrated the elements of which it was composed are still in existence, and can be tested for and even measured by appropriate means; whereas, when sleep has fled it "leaves no wrack behind" save its mysterious restorative effect and certain vague recollections in the mind of the subject.

Our chief hope of gaining further light in this most important branch of physiological research—important on account of the gravity of the sleep troubles which our civilized life has engendered—seems to rest on the fact that sleep is essentially the same both in character and origin in man and in lower animals which have an infinitely simpler nervous organization. Here, as in so many other problems in biology, the teaching of Darwin that all living beings are bound together in blood relationship is of the utmost use in unravelling complex phenomena which completely baffled the methods of the older order of physiologists.

But, in the meantime, it is well that we should keep our eyes open to every other possible source of information. The physician who would understand the state of the brain in sleep in order that he may combat the distressing symptoms and disastrous

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consequences of insomnia, must by no means neglect—what was an important part of the professional duty of his lineal predecessor, the mystery man of the barbarous ages—the interpretation of dreams. Just as we are not infrequently able to localize the seat of some internal disease by taking note of the facial expression and mental disposition of a patient, so (according to the writer's experience) the cause of not a few obscure cases of insomnia can be learned from the character of the dreams which accompany the long delayed slumber. The reason is that sleep is often seriously interfered with, especially in those who have the nervous system in an irritable state from worry or overwork, by irregularities in the functions of other parts of the body which do not attract the patient's attention when awake, but which, in that delicately balanced condition when the mind is isolated from other disturbing agencies, suffice to give the thoughts a definite direction; just as electric currents, too slight to be otherwise appreciable, will deflect the needle of a sensitive galvanometer. Thus, defective sleep very frequently results from disturbances of the digestive apparatus, or from a slight interference with the functions of the heart or lungs, of which the patient is himself quite unaware, but which will give rise to dreams of a sufficiently characteristic nature to enable an expert to diagnose the true nature of the case.

A considerable experience in treating ailments of this kind has convinced me that the study of dreams is important on practical as well as on philosophic grounds, for not infrequently the future of a dreamer depends quite as much on the right interpretation of his visions as it was thought to do in the days of the Egyptian and Babylonish monarchies.

But dreaming, apart from its pathological aspect, is a subject of perennial interest to all. So mysterious, and so apart from our conscious selves, are the workings of the brain during sleep, that our curiosity is constantly provoked, and we ask the question—"What could have made me dream in such and such a manner?" Very often no shadow of a reason can be brought forward in answer; and we can well understand the belief of the ancients that dreams were occasioned by some supernatural intervention. Nor will deliberate introspection, and the ordinary methods of the psychologists help us here to any great extent. To the normal waking intellect the Sleep Land must always re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

main a foreign and unknown country, where the laws and customs are utterly different from those by which the waking mind lives and moves; and where even the stable verities of space and time are turned topsy-turvy. To be in two places at once is as much a matter of course to the dreamer as it was to Sir Boyle Roche's immortal bird, for dream landscapes are as miscible as wine and water; while two or more characters can with the greatest ease be merged into one, like the faces in a composite photograph. A month may be crammed into a moment, and yet have plenty of room to stretch out its weeks and days. Events occurring at one spot may, without the least break of continuity, be transferred to the antipodes, and the flitting is of such a commonplace character that no one raises an eyebrow. It is a land which we may only enter blindfold, and under a spell which transmutes everything into a mercurial dream-equivalent; and before we again pass the boundary (intangible as a line of longitude, yet often more difficult to cross than Alps or oceans) we are made to drink of lethe, and carry next to nothing away.

But, for all that, it is a region where there is much more movement astir than we generally imagine, and where a great deal of important business is in progress, beyond that of overhauling the animal machinery. We do not know enough of this unconscious cerebration—this commerce incessantly carried on among the brain cells—to be able to understand the full utility of such a perpetual bustle of ideas. We are in the position of a child who peers through the dust-dimmed windows of a factory; or of a savage looking down upon the roaring Bourse.

Speaking very generally one may say that during sleep the brain does an immense amount of sorting and pigeon-holing of impressions received since the previous night's rest. It would appear also that some process akin to stock-taking, and the rummaging of out-of-the-way corners, also goes on when the judgment and will are taking holiday. In certain emergencies the usual "night staff" of the brain are capable of much more than such junior-clerk's work as this; but whether they can accomplish the marvels we sometimes read of without calling up some of their day colleagues (unknown perhaps to the head of the firm) is doubtful. Let it suffice for present purposes to say that this unconscious cerebration during sleep is undoubtedly of great utility, and is probably essential to every being with the least

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spark of reasoning power; and that to it, in the first place, may be attributed the phenomena of dreaming.

Whether the occasional emergence of the traffic into the department of consciousness is in any way necessary to the mind in health is quite another matter, and I am inclined to think that we should, most of us, get along very well if we were never aware of dreaming throughout the whole of our lives. But we should dream, nevertheless. Certain writers on physiology (whom I will not specify by name) still take it for granted that we never dream except when we are aware, on awaking, of having done so. This idea was commonly prevalent among the physiologists of the first half of the century, as also was the belief that dreaming only occurred at the moment when consciousness began to resume its sway. The evidence, however, points conclusively to the existence of a certain amount of cerebral activity during the whole period of sleep, and there can be no doubt that the vast majority of our dreams never come to our knowledge. In considering the raw material of dreams we must therefore take into account this unbroken current of ideas which passes through the sleeping brain, and which only reveals itself to the conscious ego when some disturbing element intervenes. We may compare it to an invisible and silent river, flowing by without betraying its presence, save where there is a splash of a fish or of a falling stone, or some foaming eddy where a rock breaks the smooth surface.

If the question be asked, What is the nature of this procession of dream-ideas, and from whence do they come? the answer is: They may consist of reproductions of any thought or circumstance which may have impressed the memory from our earliest childhood. The storehouses of the mind are of incredible vastness. We are apt to judge of the contents of our memories by our volitional power of recollection; but the two bear as little relationship as do the treasure-vaults of a bank and the drawing power of a single depositor. Nothing that the eyes have seen, or the ears have heard, or which has once passed the turn-stile of one of the other senses, is ever let go. Every face of the thousands we survey in passing through a great city, every word on every page we read, every tree and hill and stream we catch a glimpse of as we are whirled along on the railroad, every sound which vibrates on our ears from morning to night, is indelibly registered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

within. They may be, and most of them are, entered on the record without our knowledge, and they may remain there for a great part of a lifetime without our having any suspicion of their presence, and quite beyond the reach of our powers of recollection ; but for all that they are there, and may come to light under appropriate conditions.

It is not possible on the present occasion to discuss the evidence which seems to justify this belief. The proof rests, however, chiefly on the fact that, on seeing something a second time (as, for instance, a landscape or a building), we often become aware that we have carried a mental picture, made up of innumerable details, within our memories for many months or years. It is also found that in certain peculiar mental states, such as those induced in hypnotized subjects, or which accompany other abnormal cerebral conditions, an incredible power is manifested of reproducing the minutest particular of things seen or heard many years before. But the quiet and even unrolling of the endless panorama of memory during sleep is not sufficient of itself to account for remembered dreams. There must be a selective agency which picks out this or that incident, and, secondly, a process of combination, which gives the ideas so seized upon their place in the extravaganzas which are performed nightly even in the most puritanical skull.

There are many ways in which an idea can thus be singled out and rendered luminous. As in the waking state, it may result from the confluence of distant streams of thought. We are often conscious, when we analyze our mental processes, of separate undercurrents three or four deep, flowing beneath what is ostensibly occupying our minds ; and not infrequently, when some original or vivid thought leaps suddenly into prominence, we are aware that it is the result of such a union. Or perhaps it would be more correct to say that the clash and friction of two intersecting streams of ideas results in bringing both into prominence, as two individuals, passing unnoticed along the footway, may suddenly, by colliding, become the centre of interest to all the street. Or, again, to use a more poetic simile, we may compare the sudden luminosity of a point among the dim and dubious currents of sub-concious thoughts to the bright spots of a nebula, where two meteor streams cut one another.

There can be no doubt that when the will is off duty the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

various parts of the thinking apparatus work in almost absolute independence. It is no uncommon experience to wake with words on our lips which have no relation whatever to the dream which arouses us. The pictures which most people can see upon their eyelids in the dark generally have no reference to the thoughts which, at the same moment, are making themselves known to the consciousness; and if we watch such an eyelid vision, it keeps changing in a manner so independent of our will, and takes shapes so at variance with what is occupying our mind at the time, that it is difficult to avoid the impression that the pictures are caused by some agency which is not ourselves. And this is the case even when "the mind's eye" has before it some definite scene. Last night, while lying awake, I was thinking of an incident of Lord Roberts's march to Candahar, and had before me a mental picture of a glaring Afghan plain backed by mountains, and of a troop of Pathan horsemen, with swaying lances and flying drapery, sweeping across it in a cloud of dust. Being aware at the time that certain objects were shaping themselves upon the black background of my eyelids, I withdrew my thoughts momentarily from Afghanistan (but not enough to obliterate the desert landscape) and was at once conscious of a vision of—innumerable old boots, of all shapes and sizes, but in a uniform condition of utter dilapidation! These two subjective pictures, so ridiculously incongruous, were both visible at once, and, although they appeared on different planes, there was no superimposition of either; and a vague impression was created that the boots were before the eyes and the war scene behind them.

Again, we occasionally wake with a start with the impression that we have been touched, or that we have heard certain words or some loud and ominous sound, and yet we are aware that this has interrupted a dream, and has not formed part of it. It would seem, therefore, that many of the brain centres, especially those of the organs of perception, have each an independent power of ideation, and that, during sleep, several of them may be exercising it at the same time.

Now, one of the most constant and automatic operations of the brain, both in man and in the lower animals, is the collation of information received from the several sense organs. A dog hears a rustle in the bushes which might be caused by any moving object; he turns his eyes in the direction of the sound,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and catches a glimpse of a small brown animal; he lowers his nose, and perceives a peculiar odor. The several impressions so received—each of which would be insufficient as a trustworthy guide to action—are combined, and are referred to memories of previous experience, and the result is the idea "rabbit." Yet, since the materials for a mental picture are but meagre, the aid of the imagination would in all probability be called in to give definiteness to the concept before the act of pursuit was commenced. All animals, except those very low down in the scale, must employ this method in order to interpret the impressions received through the senses. It is as necessary for existence as any other power or instinct which they possess, and must come into play automatically on every occasion when movements (other than those which are the outcome of mere reflex excitability) are resorted to in response to messages received from the external world. We must remember also that in the case imagined each of the ears would give a different version of the sound heard, and that only by comparing them could the dog tell from what spot the vibrations originated; while the eyes, by presenting independent and slightly different images, would provide data for estimating the distance and bulk of the object seen.

This process of continually comparing impressions received through different channels and of correcting the testimony of one sense by that of another, is as universal and automatic as the act of breathing. Being almost entirely independent of volition it would be likely, like other involuntary vital processes, to go on while the will is in abeyance during sleep. It is the experience of every dreamer that the sleeping mind is swayed by a propensity to theorize upon and explain that which is brought before it.

Now it becomes apparent, on a little reflection, that if, when the judgment is in abeyance, we have each of the centres connected with the organs of sense romancing on its own account in complete independence of the others, and at the same time this inveterate habit of comparing the reports so given in, and of advancing theories to reconcile all the diverse "facts" (for, asleep or awake, we "believe our own senses"), we have nearly all that is necessary for the manufacture of a typical dream. Nor are the reports which seem to come from without the only things which the sleeping mind seeks to interpret. Two or more independent currents of thought may become emphasized at the same

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moment, and these will be at once taken cognizance of by the "explanatory centre," and an attempt made to harmonize them *inter se*, and to fit them into the theory which is in course of construction. The central "incident" of a dream, as well as the prevailing *motif*, may depend on the dominance of one or more of the sense-impressions or thought-streams over the others. In the latter case this may be accounted for by the sudden emergence of some moving memory, or by the nascent liveliness of the product of an idea-marriage; in the former, some *quasi* message from the outer world may contain a modicum of truth, for it is seldom that the sentinels of the soul are dead asleep, and the ears especially are likely to transmit real vibrations to mix with and outvoice the ghost-sounds of the auditory centre. For, except in abnormal conditions of the brain, genuine sense impressions resulting from material stimuli will always take precedence of those which are merely subjective. Hence a noise which sets the auditory apparatus to work, or a draught of cold air which sends a shiver through the sensory nerves of one part of the body, may not only give rise to a dream, but will be likely to exercise a prevailing influence on the "explanatory centre" from beginning to end. Again, when one of the viscera is in trouble and sends an unceasing stream of complaints to the brain, this will, as most of us know by sad experience, so influence the other faculties as to change a couch of rest into a place of torment. All the throng of facile and errant fancies forthwith take service under this sombre chief and become as zealous to inflict misery as the familiars of Torquemada. It will be seen, however, that in this class of cases, the factitious evidence, although subsidiary to the genuine, is still capable of distorting it in the most fantastic fashion; so that the conclusion arrived at is, as often as not, on a par with the most outrageous premise.

Occasionally the problem to be answered does not arise out of the dream material, but is arbitrarily propounded beforehand. In this case it may have not the remotest connection with any of the topics which may casually trickle to the fore during sleep. Yet these are pressed into the service of the "explanatory centre," to elucidate the standing riddles, and, to do them justice, they never shirk the attempt. This is often the case when we retire to rest with our minds vaguely puzzled over some minor matter. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brooding process, so begun, is continued with hardly any break of continuity after the will has withdrawn for the night, and when many of the couplings of the rational machinery are disconnected, like those of an engine which is at rest in the repairing shed. But on the retirement of the trained and practical staff of psychic agencies their place is taken by a mob of casual and vagrant notions, who take up the task with light-hearted alacrity. These, by ignoring all difficulties, and by over-riding all logical restraints, arrive with the utmost ease at a solution. Whereupon both we and our new helpers rejoice together, and there is much congratulatory shaking of immaterial hands. The deputy ego (that good, foolish fellow, who ostensibly takes charge when the ego is off duty) is most agreeably surprised to find that the job has proved so easy, and glows and struts with honest pride.

It has occurred to me that possibly this feeling of satisfaction at the conclusion of a dream argument (which is only equalled under ordinary waking conditions when we have accomplished some difficult feat, or duty, in a thoroughly creditable manner) may have a more legitimate basis than is apparent. Given the farrago of heterogeneous and incompatible items which the uncontrolled sense organs and the errant memory fling together, the final outcome, however insane it seems, may perhaps be the only legitimate or possible one according to certain mysterious laws of deduction which prevail in Sleep Land.

In a recent volume of the *Journal of the Proceedings of The Society for Psychical Research*, Mr. Robert Louis Stevenson describes a dream which he had during an illness at Nice, which illustrates the propensity during sleep to interpret what is occupying the mind, with an utter disregard of the appropriateness of the means.

"In the afternoon there sprang up a storm of wind, with monstrous clouds of dust; my room looked on a steep hill of trees whose boughs were all blowing in the same direction; the world seemed to pass my windows like a mill-race. By this turmoil of movement I was confused, but not distressed, and surprised not to be distressed; for even in good health a high wind has often a painful influence upon my nerves. In the midst of this I dozed off asleep. I had just been reading Scott's life of Dryden, had been struck with the fact that Dryden had translated some of the Latin hymns, and had wondered I had never remarked them in his works. As soon as I was asleep I dreamed a reason why the sound of the wind and the sight of the flying dust had not distressed me. There was no wind, it seemed, no dust; it was only Dryden singing his hymns in *one direction*, and all those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who had blamed or attacked him after the revolution singing them in another. This point about the two directions is very singular or insane. In part, it meant that Dryden was continuously flying past yet never passing my window in the direction of the wind and dust, and all his detractors similarly flying past yet not passing towards the other side. But it applied, besides this, both to the words and to the music in a manner wholly insusceptible of expression."

In this case we must remember that the dreamer was suffering from illness, and therefore, from the disturbed state of the cerebral circulation, the fancies were of an exceptionally fantastic and vivid character. Nevertheless, the processes we see underlying them are essentially those of ordinary sleep-ideation. The chief problem to be explained here was: *Why am I not distressed by the wind and dust?* The method adopted by the novelist's deputy ego (or other fellow, as he prefers to style him) was that of combining the recollection of the facts about Dryden with the recollection (aided by continued auditory impressions) of the wind bowing the trees. As is often the case, the main problem had certain other questions mixed up with it. Mr. Stevenson states that he had been wondering why he had not seen the hymns in Dryden's works; and also that he had been watching the storm-swept branches of the trees which seemed to present the appearance of rushing by like a mill-race. The dream seems to attempt an explanation of both these points, as well as of the previous one. This merging of several distinct questions into one very often happens in dreams, and of course contributes not a little to their fantastic character.

Generally speaking, the sleeping mind seems to have little or no power of voluntary selection in dealing with the materials given to it, and totally lacks the faculty, continually exercised in the waking state, of extracting from the memory the special items which would be of most service in arriving at a judgment. As a controlling or directing agent the deputy ego is the veriest sham. Yet he never fails to put a good face on it, and gravely makes believe to weigh each of the multifarious scraps tossed at random into the dream-kaleidoscope by the sense organs or the memory; and pretends to superintend the arrangement of the resulting fortuitous pattern. In fact the Viceroy of Sleep Land resembles nothing in nature so much as a stage fool. Therein, in fact, lies his chief merit; for if we consider for a moment we shall find that we have every reason to be thankful for his com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

placent and boundless fatuity. It is impossible to astonish or disconcert him; and he is so sublimely confident and self-satisfied that his weary chief is seldom disturbed from rest, even in the most thrilling dream emergency.

Briefly to sum up: (1) It would be seen that, owing to the unceasing "unconscious cerebration" which is a necessary concomitant of our powers of intellect, the brain is always in part awake, and is especially active in shifting memorized matter. (2) The cerebral centres connected with the sense organs are (for some reason which we cannot at present explain) continually and independently employed in stimulating impressions from without. (3) Certain of the senses (especially that of hearing) remain open to external influences during sleep and convey actual vibrations to the brain. (4) There exists an ever active and purely involuntary predisposition on the part of the mental apparatus to compare and collate all the messages which come, or seem to come, from without, through the sense channels; and to collate these again with what is brought to the consciousness by involuntary recollection. (5) Associated with this there is a tendency (also automatic) to combine the evidence (real or bogus) so collected into a coherent whole, and to make the result either explain the more emphatic thoughts or impressions, or else answer some questions which occupied the attention before sleep began. (6) No voluntary power exists during sleep to pick out from the jumble handed in that which is relevant to the problem to be solved, or even to discern whether any piece of *pseudo* information is appropriate or the reverse for such a purpose. (7) Just as there is no power to discriminate real from false impressions at the outset, so, throughout a dream, we are completely oblivious to the most glaring fallacies and inconsistencies.

It will be seen that in the brief suggestions here put forward, I have not attempted to account for more than the familiar phenomena of every-night dreaming. Yet, even in these dreams, which, from their unusual character, attract especial attention (and which are usually associated with some abnormal or pathological condition) we may detect the same principles and the same essential processes at work; although, in such instances, we shall generally find that certain departments of the mind are in a state of activity which are usually quiescent during slumber.

LOUIS ROBINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PARLIAMENTARY MANNERS.

BY JUSTIN M'CARTHY, M. P.

ENGLAND is acknowledged by every one to be the mother of modern parliaments. The saying has become quite a platitude among us of late. But although every modern nation may have adopted its scheme of parliamentary institutions from England, it is curious to note how very widely the parliaments sprung from England differ among themselves and differ from England's in their ways of doing business. The parliaments which come directly from England differ from her most of all. No one can doubt that the American Congress "stems," as a German would say, from the British Parliament—and how could it be possible for two legislative systems to be more utterly different in rules and practices and ways of doing business? We have nothing in the least degree resembling the Senate of the United States. The very idea of a body empowered to overrule State treaties being also empowered to hold secret sittings for the discussion of such subjects is absolutely foreign to our system. The Senate of the United States counts for a great deal—our Upper Chamber counts for nothing, except a little delay in the passing of inevitable legislation. The rules of order in neither branch of Congress are at all like ours. In Congress a stranger is taken on to the floor of the House. In the House of Commons the very messengers of the assembly dare not move beyond the recognized line of the bar. In both the American chambers there are officials whose kindly duty it is to enable strangers to obtain seats. In the English Parliament we employ officials to do the best they can to prevent strangers from obtaining seats. The truth is that, as I shall presently show, we have not room enough for ourselves in the House of Commons, and in the secret depths of our hearts we consider all strangers as intruders and nuisances, and we want

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to get rid of them in the best way we can. Our hospitality is curiously unlike that of the Irish peasant—it is limited by the size of our dwelling—which the hospitality of the Irish peasant never is. Our "previous question" is not your "previous question," but something very different. We have no rules for calling the roll, such as those which we have all lately been reading of in the reports of the proceedings in your Senate. Our obstruction is not carried through on anything like the same lines as your obstruction.

I suppose it would be almost impossible to convey to any American mind a clear understanding of the ways of our House of Lords. Not many of us quite understand them ourselves. The Lord Chancellor is the Speaker of the House of Lords, but, high though his office be, he has none of the authority possessed by the Speaker of the House of Commons. He cannot decide on any question of order. He cannot even decide as to which peer is to speak. In the House of Lords there is no question of catching the Speaker's eye. The Lords keep order for themselves and decide, if a difference of opinion should arise, whether a peer is or is not in order, and whether this peer or that should first be heard. It would be hard to explain to an American stranger how or why so many peers sit and vote in the House of Lords by titles which the outer world never associates with their names. Then, again, how to explain the peculiar position of the Lord Chancellor? The Lord Chancellor sits on a red bench, which is called the wool-sack. But the wool-sack is not in the House of Lords. "Not in the House of Lords?" I can hear an American visitor exclaim. "Not in the House of Lords? Why I have seen him with my own eyes there in the House of Lords directing the proceedings." Yes, but the wool-sack is not technically in the House of Lords.

If the Lord Chancellor desires to make a speech—and unlike the Speaker of the House of Commons the Lord Chancellor often takes part in debate—he has to get off the wool-sack and step a few paces aside and forward, and thus bring himself constitutionally and technically into the House of Lords. More than once a Lord Chancellor has not, at his appointment to the office, been a member of the House of Lords, and consequently, although able to preside, was not able to take part in debate. Brougham was Lord Chancellor for some time before he was created a peer, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore made a member of the House of Lords. There are several other instances. But I must not expect American readers to follow me into these bewildering problems or puzzles in English parliamentary government. The comfort is that it does not greatly matter whether we have one paradox more or less in our House of Lords. The House itself is paradox enough.

One great distinction there is that I can draw between the House of Commons and any other political assembly of representative men in the civilized world with which I am acquainted or of which I have ever heard or read. That distinction is that the House of Commons alone has the practice of not providing seats enough for its members to sit down in. You may be elected to the House of Commons by an overwhelming majority of voters. Your return may be recognized as valid and certain beyond the possibility of petition or adverse decision from the judges who deal with questions of electoral law. You may have been formally introduced to the House of Commons by two political comrades, one walking at either side. You may, thus escorted, have walked up the floor of the House to the table where the gowned and wigged clerks are sitting just under the august throne of Mr. Speaker. You may have handed in the certificate of your election. You may have signed the roll. I wonder why one's hand shakes as he signs that roll? I have signed it, I think, six times at successive elections, and my hand always quivered in the process. You may have sworn the prescribed oath and shaken the Speaker's hand of formal welcome. And yet have you found a seat in the House of Commons? Nothing of the kind. You are a member of the House, to be sure, just as much as Mr. Gladstone is—but have you got a seat in the House? No, you have not—at least you have not got a place to sit down in.

The House of Commons has some six hundred and seventy members, and it has seats for little more than half the number. Even if we take into account the Members' galleries, which run along two sides of the chamber, there still is not nearly room enough for all the men who are entitled to take their places in the House of Commons. What are the members to do who have not got seats? They are to do the best they can—to do anything they like short of taking seats in the House. They may crowd the bar—I do not mean any place of refreshment, although they may crowd that bar, too, if they please; I mean they may stand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

below the line which is supposed to represent the brass bar that can, when occasion requires, be drawn out from either side, and so conjoined as to represent the division between some petitioner, or some alleged offender, and the House of Commons itself. They may stay in the newspaper room or the tea room; they may fall asleep in the library; they may walk on the terrace; they may lounge in the smoking room; but they cannot sit in the House. As in England there are so many superfluous women who could not possibly find husbands here, under our present matrimonial system, so in the House of Commons there are so many members who cannot possibly find seats. The struggle for seats from day to day is a curious and interesting competition, of which, so far as I know, the English House of Commons has an absolute monopoly.

It is in one sense a question of first come first served. The House of Commons usually meets at three o'clock in the afternoon. A member may come down to the House as early as he pleases and select a seat. If he comes very early—say at eight in the morning—he has on ordinary occasions a fair chance of a good place. He selects his place and he puts his hat into it. Then he goes away, to return at three o'clock when prayers are said by the chaplain of the House—at present and for some time past my distinguished friend Archdeacon Farrar. In the meantime our member in quest of a seat must not stir one inch outside the buildings which belong to the House of Commons. His claim to a seat is supposed to rest on his attention to the service of the House—and if he crosses a threshold for one moment outside the precincts of the House his claim to a seat is forfeit. So he spends from eight o'clock until three lounging about the library and the smoking-rooms, and the newspaper room, and at three he comes back into the House and listens to the prayers. Then having complied with all that ceremonial and having spent his whole day in nominal service of the House he is entitled to insert in a little brass frame at the back of his seat a small card bearing the printed word "prayers" and his own name written beneath, and thus he has secured that seat for the one sitting only. The struggle has to begin afresh on the very same conditions to-morrow.

There are certain men who are exempted from this struggle, and exempted, too, from the necessity of listening to prayers. These

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are the members of the government and the men who composed the former government. The front bench on the side of the table at the speaker's right hand belongs to the members of the government; the front bench on his left is assigned by tradition and courtesy to the members of the late government. So the members of the government and the members of the late government are not compelled to be present when prayers are said as a condition to the securing of their seats for the evening. Accordingly they never are present at prayers. The only members of the House of Commons who never join in the prayers for the welfare of the Sovereign and the security and prosperity of the State are the men who are now governing the State and the men who were governing it the day before yesterday, and are madly anxious to be governing it again the day after to-morrow. Only the rank and file of the House of Commons are put to the trouble of attending prayers. The mere fact that you do attend prayers proclaims you to be a member of the rank and file. The moment you mount up in the service of the State you cease to attend prayers as a matter of course. Why should a privy councillor pray? One might as well not be a privy councillor if a privy councillor had to pray.

Now this is a part of the usages of the House of Commons which I would certainly alter if I could. I would abolish the public prayer altogether, or I would cease to make it a mere condition of securing a seat from which those who had seats already secured to them were understood to be entirely, properly, and naturally exempt. We are proud of our anomalies in the House of Commons. We are inclined to think that we could not get on in a constitutional parliament without a great many anomalies. I confess that I cannot see any reason to be proud of the anomaly which makes the listening to a prayer the one essential condition to an ordinary member's obtaining a seat for the evening and allows the leaders of the assembly on both sides to free their heads from any thought of a necessity for troubling themselves about joining in the public prayer to Heaven which is offered up in the hearing of their inferiors.

In every other parliamentary assembly that I know of each member has his assigned and recognized place, which he holds until the end either of the session or of the parliament. In most other parliaments that I know of each member has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a desk to write on while the House is carrying on its debate. In the House of Commons there is no desk for any member and the rule is that no man is to write a line or take a note or read a book or a newspaper in the debating chamber itself, except for the actual purposes of that debate. You may take a note of something said in the speech of a man to which you propose to reply. You may hold in your hand a cutting from a newspaper containing an account of some facts by which you propose to strengthen your reply. But you must not write an ordinary letter or glance for your own amusement at a book or a newspaper. If you venture to do anything of the kind you have the Sergeant-at-Arms down upon you at once with gentle but firm admonition.

My friend, the Honorable Edward Blake, who held a great position for many years in the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, and who is now a member of our House of Commons, told me that the late Mr. W. E. Forster, an English statesman of some mark, said to him in Ottawa that he could not understand how anything could be argued in favor of the Canadian practice, which is also the American practice, in regard to the occupying of desks and the writing of letters in the House itself—in the chamber of debate. Mr. Blake replied that on the contrary he could not understand how anything could be said against it. Mr. Forster argued that a great statesman might be making a great speech and no one would listen to him—men would go on writing their letters and not caring what he was saying. Mr. Blake insisted that according to universal experience the moment a good speech began men put aside their letter-writing and listened. This, of course, is my personal observation and experience. What is the difference? In the English House of Commons men go out the moment an uninteresting speaker gets up and hurry to the library or to one of the lobbies to write their letters. When the hour for the provincial and foreign post is arriving they rush out in a very stampede—they rush out as if they were flying madly for their lives—striving to escape from a house on fire. I wonder which would disconcert an ordinary speaker more—to observe that a number of his brother members were calmly writing letters while he was going on with his oration, or that they were flying like a disorganized and panic-stricken rabble from the House under his very eyes?

I have never quite understood why the House of Commons

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should be considered a highly orderly assembly. I am not now writing with any special reference to certain recent scenes of tumult and disorder there. But I never, during my long acquaintance with the House of Commons, could understand where its title to be considered an orderly and decorous legislative assembly came in. My opinion is that when it is not a dull assembly it is often very disorderly. The House of Commons, in fact, is too large in numbers and too contracted in space to be orderly when any exciting question is under debate. I do not know how any assembly could in very exciting times be decorous and orderly when men are crammed up together within hearing of every interruption and indeed of every word. The recent riot —for it was nothing short of a riot during the short time it lasted —in the House of Commons was mainly caused by the fact that men were pent up so closely together that the movement of one man from his place suggested to another man that he who first sought to push his way through must have had it in his mind to assault somebody. But without considering the recent riot the House of Commons is almost the noisiest and rudest legislative assembly with which I have any manner of personal acquaintance.

I remember attending several sittings of the parliamentary assembly at Versailles when France was just beginning to pull herself together after the complete defeat of her armies in the French and Prussian war. I had just returned from a long visit to the United States—I heard at Liverpool the news of the fall of the Commune and the entry of the Versailles troops into Paris. I had not been in Paris for four years, and I was naturally anxious to see how things were going there. So I assisted, if I may use the phrase, at the birth of the new political reorganization. I had known the late Louis Blanc during his years of exile in London, and he secured me a place each day for several days in the assembly which held its sittings in the theatre of the palace at Versailles. That was, indeed, a time of wild emotion—a time prompting to disorder. The Legitimists were full of high hope —the Orleanists were not without expectation of opportunity— the Bonapartists, not altogether driven to despair, were full of wild desire to fight—nobody knew whether or not a civil war was impending; anything might have happened; there was no landmark left anywhere; there was no load-star visible nor any guid-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing light in the sky. Yet I must say that the meetings of that assembly under those conditions—conditions the like of which no civilized country has known in our time—were not disorderly, were not seriously disturbed, did not make the President of the Assembly powerless, did not at any time that I saw call for the serious intervention of authority. I have heard debates on the reconstruction of the whole political system of France conducted with more quietude and more decorum than will be found in an ordinary discussion of the House of Commons when the time for division is drawing near and anything of political and partisan significance is depending on the vote. I know, of course, that there have been of late some fierce disturbances in the French representative assembly. But, considering all things, I do not think that France has any particular reason to be ashamed of the manner in which its representative assemblies since the fall of the Empire have tried to keep public order.

I believe that towards the outbreak of the Civil War in America there were some disorderly scenes on the floor of the House of Representatives. Disorder was almost inevitable, quite inevitable, sometimes, at a crisis when all the old systems of order were breaking up under men's eyes. But, except for such a time as that, I must say that the House of Representatives in Washington has always seemed to me a very respectable and decorous assembly. I may have been particularly lucky in the occasions on which I visited that assembly—they were a good many, and extended over nearly a quarter of a century—but I must say that it was my happy fortune never to see anything like disturbance in the House of Representatives at Washington. Of the Senate at Washington I need not speak. It is the best second chamber I have ever seen. It is not less orderly and less decorous than the House of Lords. Even in the recent all-night sittings of the Senate there does not seem to have been anything like disorder.

The one great guarantee of order in the House of Commons is the absolute deference paid to the authority of the Speaker. On that one momentous night in this session when there was a riot in the House of Commons it happened when the House was in committee, and the chairman of Ways and Means presiding, but the moment the Speaker was sent for and mounted into his chair the disturbance was over. That was a strange night in our par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liamentary history. Not for two centuries at least had blows been interchanged on the floor of the House of Commons. The occupants of the Strangers' Gallery hissed on that occasion—a portentous sound. Never, even in the most exciting debates, or at the moment of the most thrilling division, did I hear the occupants of the Strangers' Gallery take general part in any expression of approval or disapproval. We are not like the one legislative chamber of Greece, where the strangers in the galleries shout, yell, cheer, hiss and accompany every speaker on the floor of the House with a perfect *charivari* of admiration or abhorrence. In the House of Commons the strangers are almost always well-behaved and self-controlled. Their propriety of demeanor is all the more to be praised when we consider the sort of example which they commonly get from the members of the representative chamber.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RAILROAD ACCIDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND ENGLAND.

BY H. G. PROUT, EDITOR OF THE "RAILROAD GAZETTE."

THE British Board of Trade reports that in 1892 there were twenty-one passengers killed in train accidents in the United Kingdom. In the same year there were one hundred and sixteen passengers killed in the same class of accidents in the United States.* In the months of August, September and October, 1893, there were at least one hundred and eight passengers killed on the railroads of the United States. The record of these three months is a national humiliation; it must grieve every patriotic citizen, for our railroads are the most remarkable industrial institution of the land, and the one in which a great many of us take the most pride. But the normal record, if it is shown by the figures of 1892, is bad enough; that is, 5½ times as many passengers are killed in the United States as in the United Kingdom in a normal year. Apparently the matter will stand looking into. I propose to take up the inquiry under two heads: (1) Do we habitually kill more passengers than the Englishmen, and why? (2) Did we kill more than the average in the last three months of the World's Fair, and why?

Let us start with the table on the next page compiled from reliable statistics, giving data for the United Kingdom and the United States.

* The statistics for 1892 must be taken from the *Railroad Gazette*, as only an abstract of those of the Interstate Commerce Commission is yet out. They are imperfect, and subject to some correction, but are accurate enough for comparison. It must be borne in mind that we are speaking now of train accidents only—that is, accidents in which moving trains were involved and of casualties to the occupants of moving trains. This class of casualties is only a small part of the total, but is the only one which directly concerns the passenger.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1)	Passengers killed. (2) U. K.	(3) U. S.	Millions of passenger journeys for one passenger killed. (4) U. K.	(5) U. S.	Millions of train-miles for one passenger killed. (6) U. K.	(7) U. S.
1887	25	207	29.3	2.1	10.3	3.1
1888	11	168	67.5	2.7	26.5	4.0
1889	88	108	8.8	4.6	3.4	6.6
1890	18	172	45.4	2.9	17.4	4.6
1891	5	177	169.1	3.1	64.7	4.7
1892	21	116	43.1	4.9	15.6	6.3
Average	28	158	60.5	3.8	23.1	5.0
Ratios	5.6		16		4.6	

From the averages of columns (2) and (3) we find 5.6 times as many passengers killed in the United States in six years as in the United Kingdom. But that proves nothing unless we know how many passengers were carried in the two countries. Columns (4) and (5) give us that measure. Those columns give the millions of passengers carried for each one killed. That is, in the United Kingdom there were 60½ million people who made one journey for one killed, and in the United States $3\frac{8}{10}$. In other words considering only the number of journeys and not the distance travelled it was 16 times as safe to travel by rail in the United Kingdom as in the United States. But here comes in a serious error. The passenger movement is not measured by the number alone but by the number and distance. For example, 10 persons, travelling 100 miles each, make 1,000 passenger-miles, and so do 100 persons travelling 10 miles each; and in each case the danger of accident is about equal. But the English never report the fundamental units of work, the passenger-mile and the ton-mile, while the Americans always do. The want of these units vitiates the English railroad statistics, and this shows how worthless columns (2) and (3) and columns (4) and (5) are for comparison. The average passenger journey in the United States is a good deal longer than in England; therefore the ratio of 16 shown by (4) and (5) is too great.

In columns (6) and (7) I have tried to get another basis of comparison. Those columns show the *millions* of miles made by all trains in both countries for one passenger killed. I have included freight trains as well as passenger, for the danger to passengers increases with the movement of freight trains. We see that in England $23\frac{1}{10}$ million miles were run by trains of all classes for one passenger killed, and in the United States 5 millions. Or, by this standard, it appears to have been more than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

4½ times as dangerous to travel in the United States as in the United Kingdom.

And now the reader can take his choice. It may be five times as dangerous to travel by rail in the United States as in the United Kingdom, or it may be 16 times ; not having the passenger-mile unit we can only guess, and we should guess wildly. But there can be no doubt that the danger is much greater here than there. Why ?

December 31, 1892, there were in the United Kingdom 19,288 miles of railroad open for passenger traffic, and in the United States there were 175,233 miles. The British railroads cost about $200,000 a mile; the American cost about $50,000.* Safety is not in direct proportion to cost, but the two are closely allied. Again, in 1890, we had 375 inhabitants to one mile of railroad, and in 1891 England had 1,875 inhabitants to one mile of railroad ; we ran 12.6 train miles for each inhabitant, and in England 7.1 train miles were run for each inhabitant. That is, the public accommodation as measured by train-miles run was 1.8 times as great, and as measured by miles of railroad was five times as great here as there. Again, the average charge for hauling one ton of freight one mile is 0.967 cent in the United States, and probably between 2 and 2½ cents in England. The failure of the Englishmen to report the unit of traffic, the ton-mile, makes this last figure uncertain, but the range here given is accepted by the best authorities. Again, the average passenger fare in the United States is undoubtedly lower than in England, but this is a vexed and complicated subject, too long to go into here.

The meaning of all this is that you cannot eat your cake and have it. You cannot have about as many miles of railroad as all the other nations of the earth together, more miles per head than any other people, more train service than any other people, and cheaper freight rates than any one else in the world, and at the same time have more of the elements of safety than any one else. If the English standard had been enforced here half or three-quarters of our railroads (to jump at a figure) could not have been built. We have allowed investors to build railroads and work them when and where and how they chose, and one result

* The cost per mile is not a matter capable of exact determination. The usual figure of $50,000 a mile is obtained by counting certain securities twice. The Interstate Commerce Commission gives the total stock and debt as $60,942 per mile in 1891.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been far the boldest and most energetic creation of a transportation system that mankind has ever attempted, and much the most wonderful development of a nation that history has ever known. Another result has been a quality of construction, equipment and operation that, to put it mildly, is not the safest in the world. All the facts and conditions must be looked at together; so looked at that they are a splendid example of the blessings and penalties of liberty. There is no question in my mind that in this instance the sum of the blessings vastly outweighs the sum of the penalties.

But this is general; I set out to say specifically why we kill more passengers than the English,—having shown that we do. Of the 19,288 miles of railroad open for traffic in the United Kingdom in 1891, 11,043 miles, or fifty-seven per cent. was double track; in the United States about five and one-half per cent. is double track. The absolute block system is used on 17,343 miles, or ninety per cent. of the railroads of the United Kingdom; in the United States the block system, absolute or permissive, is used on about five per cent. In the United Kingdom ninety-four per cent. of all junctions, crossings, turnouts, and passing and yard switches used by passenger trains are protected by interlocked signals. In the United States there are no records from which it is possible even to estimate the amount of such protection; but while it is considerable absolutely, it is very small relatively. But double tracks, block signals and interlocked signals at switches and crossings will prevent collisions except in the rare cases when an engineman disregards a signal, or from some defect in apparatus cannot stop his train at a signal; and collisions are about forty-six per cent. of all our train accidents.

In car and engine equipment the English have no advantage over us. On the contrary their lighter cars are more easily crushed in a wreck, their cars and tenders are more easily derailed, and their brake apparatus is on the whole probably inferior to ours. But their track is beyond question better. The best American track is safe enough. For final economy in maintenance, roads of heavy traffic may find it worth while to raise their track above the best of present standards, but not for safety alone. But that is not true of the average track, and doubtless more than 10 per cent. of our accidents are from defects of road.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A great deal is said in the newspapers about defective discipline as a cause of train accidents in the United States. There are no classified statistics that will give any just measure of the number due to this cause. The *Railroad Gazette* statistics, which are the only attempt at such a classification, attribute five per cent. of all derailments for the last six years to negligence in operation. Let us add to this *all* the collisions (obviously a violent forcing of facts to get a theory), and we may charge fifty-one per cent. of all train accidents to negligence. The British Board of Trade attributes forty-two per cent. of all the accidents in the United Kingdom in the last eleven years to "negligence, want of care, or mistakes of officers or servants." If now we treat the English statistics as we did the American, and add all the other causes which produced collisions, we have fifty-eight per cent. chargeable to negligence in the United Kingdom as against fifty-one per cent. in the United States. This is a pretty rude way of getting at the relations of things, but so far as it goes it confirms the opinion I have long held that the American railroad officer or employee is quite as vigilant, skilful and faithful as the Englishman.

And now we may sum up. We do habitually kill more passengers than the English, and we do so because they have, per unit of railroad line, more than ten times as much double track as we have, eighteen times as much block signaling, very much more interlocking of switches and signals and considerably better average track.

I have not mentioned the dreadful loss of life at street and highway crossings, and the slaughter of trespassers on the right of way, because that is entirely another branch of the subject. In casualties of that sort we have a specialty, and are quite beyond comparison.

If my facts and conclusions are correct (and if they are not, I trust that some one will set me right), we have reduced the reasons for the greater safety of railroad travel in England to a few simple physical facts. It has also been made tolerably clear why these facts exist; that is, we get what we have been willing, or able, to pay for. One of Charles Reade's characters says of the English courts "they sell you justice prime but dear." Much the same thing can be said of transportation on the English railroads. The quality of the service is first rate, and so is the price. We

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have needed more service in proportion to the population, and cheaper service, than the inhabitants of an old and thickly-settled country, where the distances are short, and we have got it; but we have had to pay for it some way. One of the ways has been with our legs and arms, not to mention vital organs. It has been a commercial transaction, or, if you choose, a colossal real-estate speculation, and the sooner we clear our minds of sentimentality in talking about our railroads, and legislating about them, the sooner we shall learn what the real evils are and the way to remedy them.

It will be asked if we have not come to that place in developing our railroad system where a change in policy should begin; if we have not come to the place where safety should precede amount and economy of service. Certainly we have come to that place and the change *has* begun. With growing density of traffic on the more important railroads, double tracking goes on year after year and in increasing ratio. Signals of both sorts, that is, block signals and interlocked switch signals, are being introduced rapidly on lines of thin as well as heavy traffic, and increasing attention is paid to other means of safety. At the moment when I write the Safety Appliance Committee of the American Railway Association is sitting in New York to deliberate on the best means of extending the use of the block system. The American Railway Association is the most authoritative association of operating officers in America. Its consideration of block signaling is by no means a new thing, prompted by recent accidents, but has been going on carefully and systematically for two or three years. The gentlemen who compose the committee are confronted by a complicated set of conditions which are not merely mechanical, but economical and diplomatic. They approach the subject committed to them with zeal and knowledge and are impelled by the most powerful motives that actuate men. We may rest in confidence, therefore, that they will advance the matter of better signaling as fast as it can be done under the given conditions. This body and others, notably the Master Car-Builders' Association, have given a great deal of attention to other appliances, and to methods of moving trains, with a view to greater safety, and have advanced the art of railroading immensely. They are still unremitting in this work.

There are two great forces working to make railroad travel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

safer: (1) The wish to make money from operation, and (2) public opinion as embodied in laws or expressed in various ways. No one who has not been in close touch with the control of railroads realizes the pressure on operating officers to save money. Rates fall and wages rise. The laws of the States and the nation have made it impossible to keep up rates; various forces make it impossible to reduce wages, and the railroads are between the devil and the deep sea. The profits of railroad working have fallen until more than sixty per cent. of the railroad securities of the country pay no dividend whatever, and the payment on total debt, stock, bonds, floating debt and obligations of all descriptions is only a trifle over three per cent. per annum. This condition is getting worse rather than better. So there is the greatest possible inducement to save money. If the use of safety appliances can be shown to be a means of economy they will be used. If they are not a means of economy they cannot be used, except on a few favored railroads. Fortunately, as traffic increases we gradually approach the line where it is cheaper to use block signals and interlocked switch signals than not to use them. When that line is reached in the history of any given railroad company is always somewhat a matter of conjecture. The line does not stand up before men's eyes, but can be found only by experiment.

Shall we then trust to the enlightened self interest of the railroads to make travel as safe as all the conditions will permit, or shall we use the second of the great forces and make legislation more special and more stringent? We may trust to the newspapers to remind the railroads of their delinquencies, whatever happens, and therefore we have only to consider the expression of public opinion in law. This is a very big question, indeed, too big to be thrashed out at the end of a magazine article; but a few suggestions may not be out of place.

For the sake of brevity, I shall have to state as true a proposition that it is hard to prove, that may be incapable of proof, but that I believe to be true. It is that any attempts to control by special laws the methods of working railroads will in the end do more harm than good. They will transfer responsibility from the railroad officers to the law-makers, the more specific the law the more complete the transfer. They will impede development by alarming investors, as has invariably been the case where the States have undertaken to control rates. They will substitute

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for intelligent self-interest the perfunctory and arbitrary methods of bureaus. Of course, this is all a matter of degree. A little State control will do little harm and will sometimes do good. Much State control may do more good and will do more harm. But the kernel of the matter is that mankind does best when most let alone. One of our oldest and biggest railroads was long controlled very absolutely by one man, and for years no passenger was killed in one of its trains. The president's method was simple. If an accident happened all those immediately concerned were dismissed at once and without a hearing. It was rude railroading, but there was no wire-drawing and hair-splitting about discipline. Perhaps after all the best way for the State to treat the railroads in this matter of safety would be to make them pay high for loss of life and limb, and to prosecute vigorously, in the criminal courts, the individuals directly responsible for any accident.

It is not likely that the policy of the States or of the nation will be directed by such rank "individualism" as I preach. It is more likely that the notion of public control will spread and prevail for a time. In this case we could not do better, probably, than to follow pretty closely the Massachusetts commission law, modifying it a little, and to choose the commissioners to administer it from some such group of men as furnish the British Board of Trade Inspectors. This law would make it the duty of the commissioners to investigate all grave accidents thoroughly and promptly and to report upon them fully and publicly. It would give them power to call witnesses and to make them testify under oath, and to produce all records. The British Inspectors are retired officers of the Royal Engineers. They are men of education, of social standing, who cannot afford to be corrupt, and who have a safe and honorable position in the world. As professional soldiers, they are trained to a high sense of public duty. Our commissioners could be drawn from a similar class of men if the pay was good and the tenure of office long. A stern and fearless investigation of an accident, by such men, and *publicity* of the findings would be enough. No railroad could afford to ignore the warnings, or to be followed into the courts by the reports, of such a commission. In fact, this is exactly the kind of work that the Massachusetts Commission has done for a long time, and with great thoroughness and intelligence. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New York Commission and the commissions of other States have also done the same kind of work, but not so well. The results of this work, especially in Massachusetts, have often been seen in permanent improvements.

Little space is left for the second topic, the World's Fair accidents; but after all there is little that is special or peculiar to say of them. It is a fact that in August, September and October, 108 passengers were killed, that the average for three months, taking the six years' statistics already given, would be 53, and that therefore the mortality was twice the average. It is a fact, too, that most of the fatal accidents involved special trains or extra sections of regular trains, and that all but three of them were in what we may call World's Fair territory. All but one were collisions and must be classed under accidents due to negligence in operation. All but the Chester Bridge accident came from those derangements which follow a greatly increased and an unusual traffic. They may be traced to long hours and hard work by all the operating staff, from general managers to flagmen, or to the necessity for putting men at a kind of work with which they were not familiar, or to both. Who is responsible for such a condition of things? The railroad officers foresaw the danger, but some of them could not beg or borrow money for more than their daily needs, and all of them spent very liberally, according to their means, in preparing for the Fair. And then arose the question of the proper policy of the roads as to the World's Fair rates. On one side stood the press and the public demanding reduced rates, some demanding even so low a rate as one dollar from New York to Chicago, and proving that it would pay the railroads to carry passengers at any rate, and that it was their duty to do so whether it would pay them or not. On this side also was enlisted the influence of certain railroad managers anxious to stimulate a big traffic. On the other side were those men of judgment and knowledge who feared the results which have actually come. It is easy to say that they should have stood out more resolutely than they did, but the public would never have been satisfied until the matter had been carried to demonstration. The demonstration was frightfully costly in money and in lives; let us hope that the lesson will not be lost either by the railroads or the public.

H. G. Prout.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SERVANT GIRL OF THE FUTURE.

BY KATE GANNETT WELLS.

As it is always a relief to assign great causes for small evils, it might be said that the Declaration of Independence, universal suffrage and unrestricted immigration are responsible for those minor domestic woes, which are in fact the home side of the vast labor-problem that is now astride the world.

We cannot abolish the Declaration of Independence, which, as a friendly critic has said, "abolished good manners," though the exasperating impertinence of the I-am-as-good-as-you spirit found among our servants is largely due to its immortal phrases, and can only be endured through the silent conviction that we are better than they. Universal suffrage, whatever may be its advantages, gives power to those who are unfit to use it, and who attack common sense and the liberties of others. The relation of immigration to reduction of servants' wages is so palpable that it eventually will win recognition.

There are, however, lesser causes for our domestic troubles which can be removed by individual housekeepers. If men had kept house instead of women, they would long ago have met the issue squarely, either by complete submission to servants' tyranny or by insistence on prompt obedience. We women have done neither. We have compromised, we have become philanthropic and sympathetic, and then we have of a sudden insisted on our rights, until even archangels would have left us without a week's warning.

There was neither so much trouble nor so much unwise treatment of servants until women began to belong to societies and, in the name of religion, to ignore class names. It takes courage to use class names for human beings as frankly as for flowers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have curvetted between "help" (the New England word for contumacious self-respect), domestics, servants, girls and—women. From the emigrant boarding-house keeper to the *grande dame* of society, we have prefixed to whichever term is used the possessive pronoun "my." The female employed prefers the word servant—it defines her; though she disdains the livery of cap and apron, unless she works for the upper classes. A philanthropist living in a flat will even say, "I keep no servant; I have a friend." "Does she eat with you?" "*She* prefers not to."

The difference, then, between a servant and any other employee lies in the prevalent custom of servants eating in the kitchen. Such a distinction sounds brutal, but it is vital. A dressmaker, a ladylike—not "slop"—seamstress, a trained nurse, a nursery governess will not eat there, so sorrow often attends the advent of any of these personages. To the kitchen and sleeping arrangements would I first ascribe our discomfort as housekeepers. I am not writing of the homes of the wealthy where the girls have their own parlors, but of the great middle class and all the classes below it. The unsanitary discomfort of a servants' room in a third-class street is best understood by those who board in it. The patience of the American people is slight compared with that of servants, whose household gods are confined to their trunks.

If good service is desired in the future, an employer should not only beautify her kitchen, but should build it in front of the house, where the servants can watch the passers-by just as she herself likes to do. It should always have a sofa—but not one with broken springs—armchairs, rocking-chairs, etc., and the dining-table should not be allowed to present a pell-mell rehash of the food and dishes of others. Servants' chambers usually are small and dingy or large and cheerless with several girls in one room, or else the servants live in common together, as if in barracks, on the top story of apartment houses.

The second chance for improvement lies in the manners of employers. Many seem unaware that servants are to be treated as if they had feelings. People grumble at or dictate to them, scold or flatter them, are scrupulously polite or studiously ignoring, never noticing their friends' servants on the streets, and scarcely recognizing their own. If the same girl constantly opens the same door for a gentleman, he is unaware of her except as a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

means of information. At a dinner party it is considered bad form to recognize the waiter who has frequently served one. Even at a family dinner a lady guest acknowledges the presence of the waitress only by her eye-lids, the gentleman visitor not at all.

Servants are treated neither with decent natural politeness nor with frank cordiality. We are much more afraid of ourselves than of them. We expect them to work for us as if they loved us, and then we pride ourselves upon the kind advice we give them. We exhaust ourselves in preparation for our daughter's balls and deem it a lack of propriety that our servants should even want to go to parties. In the future they will go to their assemblies as freely as we go to ours, they returning as we go out. Perhaps the desire of the philanthropists to curtail the evening pleasures of their servants out of regard for their health arises from ignorance of the principle that fun is healthy. If our servants were more at liberty to do as they chose in the evening and were not obliged to be at home when the adult children are not, we should find women much more willing to accept household service. Of course the girls may be cross in the morning. So are society's daughters; both get over it. It is not strange that girls dislike housework when they know that no matter how well they have done their work they must ask leave to go out in the evening, and must be home at a fixed early hour.

A third point in the service of the future will be the right of servants to speak their minds as freely as their employers. They do so now, but it is considered as beyond their rights. When it is their right they will not care to do it. We forgive our children if they are cross, on account of their youth: servants are always immature; can we not forgive them? It is more of a relief to them to bluster and be impertinent than it is to the educated people who are aware of their consciences. Quarrels between employers and employees entered on the records of gossip or at intelligence offices do harm to both persons. Americans have less self respect than would be inferred from their printed Constitution.

The words employer and employee bring us to the real issue in the "servant-girl question,"—the want of written contract. Among the upper classes engagements are often made from house to house. Among the lower and middle classes they are made at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intelligence offices. Though an engagement may begin well, as far as the books of the office are concerned, afterwards it is seldom that either mistress or maid keeps any memorandum of wages paid or received. Any contract for household service must largely be vague for both parties, except in regard to wages. Nor can it be wholly definite in the future, though each time the contracting parties should make it as definite as their mental peculiarities allow. In regard to wages, however, there is much to be said. It is difficult for a well-bred woman to realize how constantly girls are cheated. Wages are still due even if dishes are broken. When a girl is not morally worthy of them, she yet is legally entitled to them.

The collection of wages which are fraudulently withheld has been taken up by various women's unions, notably by the one in Boston. Out of one hundred and twenty-eight complaints received in 1891, eighty-two related to domestic service, where the ignorance of the plaintiff was as pitiable as the poverty of the defendant. If it were only poor people who deferred payment! Rich and "well-to-do" persons allow a girl's wages to run on, doling out a little from time to time, till they amount to $600 or $700.

Variation in the scale of wages results from the variety of social classes for which servants work, and from that agility in moral quibbling by which a woman entices away her friend's servant through promise of higher wages. It is only in the families of the partially middle and lower classes (terms are disagreeable) that wages are wickedly cheapened, until there is no one more to be pitied than the frowsy, incompetent, perpetually busy, half-fed and half-clothed drudge of all work, not daring to leave her place lest she have not strength, even if she have the brains, to get another. But these conditions are not peculiar to household work. Look at the sweating system! It is better after all to incur some of the evils of individual contract and of want of it,—than to be bound by a servant trades-unionism, which fixes the prices for work. Among the lower grades of servants, wages have been reduced and work increased by the influx of immigrants, only a few of whom are desirable even as cheap servants, unless they belong to the northern races. As a rule respectable families will not take immigrants and they, if doing housework, prefer to hire by the day.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In time also women will learn how to direct. Now an American mother is often a simultaneous cook, chambermaid, parlormaid and nursery maid, because she has not the courage of a commander. Or, if she has, when she has trained a servant the latter is sure to leave her, exclaims somebody. Of course, that somebody would do the same if she were in the girl's position. A mistress need not prove her knowledge by actual performance unless there is occasion. If she is poor or "middling-off" she will do fully enough work herself not to be condemned as inhuman.

Servants deceive, cheat and lie! So do ladies and children. Servants ask too many "privileges!" There is no such word in a contract. Each party has mutual rights. Not until mistresses cease to call rights by the false term of "privileges," will they have honest, continuous service. "I did every thing for her, she had so many 'privileges,' but when my children had diphtheria she left," moans a mother. Of course. Did not your friends do likewise? Would you have stayed under similar circumstances? Was it in the contract that she should remain with you in an epidemic or that you should take care of her? She was selfish to leave,—just like most people, only she was poor, dependent on herself, and should therefore be doubly careful of her health. Increase a girl's "privileges," but demand in return exact performance in work and tolerable truthfulness.

It is often said that domestic training schools would supply better servants. They might. Yet if we have trained servants in our homes they will ask higher wages, and many of us would rather teach a girl than pay more. Such schools, however, do not reach down to the families who most need efficient help, such as the family of the young mechanic and day laborer, where the girl is on an equality with the mother; and further down still to the sixth-class restaurant-keeper whose "help" must wash, wipe and wait in a second and be good tempered! It is proposed also that ladies shall sign papers agreeing to engage only those servants who have received diplomas. Self-interest never binds itself, it gets what it wants the shortest way it can.

Training schools will surely furnish one of the means for a brighter outlook, but any large result from them is to be as much doubted as from coöperative kitchens. If we should have polyandry—one woman having several husbands—the courtesy of man might allow her to avail herself of such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a kitchen, but as long as a man has but one wife he will prefer his individual kitchen and cook. Imagine an omelette-souffle served by coöperation to an impatient father of a family! Reform to the contrary, a woman's first duty is to her husband, even if, being a man, he is mistaken. A wise recourse, however, unto cook and bake shops and New England kitchens affords great relief to housekeepers and these should be largely frequented—by those who can afford it. Yet many economists of real, practical insight find in these peripatetic, coöperative kitchens the needed relief for the future. I doubt if they are right, for behind all the philanthropy, nervous-action, university-extension, college-settlement ferment which marks this special decade, there is a deep undercurrent of individual home feeling, which will make women forego "causes" for husbands and families. The knowledge which they are now so rapidly acquiring will lead them to apply it to their own homes until they will be ashamed to keep house with incompetent service; while the record of having changed servants constantly will be proof of a woman's inability to be chairman of a committee.

Domestic labor is drudgery only when it dawdles. Most of us do not know how to manage because we dare not be independent, so our servants impose on our timorousness. An intelligent, just mistress, who directs her work and cannot be humbugged, who gives her girls more leisure than she claims for herself, and who is too wise to take offence at trifles, seldom has trouble. On the other hand a nervous, capricious, kind housekeeper has no relief.

The future of our American home-life depends on this question of servants. No exclusively coöperative benefits can take the place of the daily, early "roughing" of home life, when father, mother, babies and servants are inexperienced together and each helps along towards love and order. As we grow older (or richer) we find that comprehension of the inborn limitations and perversities of servants gives us individual patience in training them until they become experienced. Then we must part with some of our personal liberties and pay them high wages. They are worthy of them, for our homes are never theirs "*de facto or de jure.*"

KATE GANNETT WELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THOUGHTS ON ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES.

BY THE LATE EDWARD A. FREEMAN, LL. D., D. C. L., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

I SPOKE in a former article* of the origin and growth of the English universities, and of the special feature which distinguishes them from the universities of other countries, namely, the existence of many colleges in one university. I will now speak of the changes which have taken place in the universities and their colleges during the last forty years. I speak mainly of Oxford, but many remarks will apply to Cambridge also. These changes fall under three main heads:

First, Changes in the constitution of the university itself and of its colleges.

Second, Changes in the relation of the university to the nation at large.

Third, Changes in the studies of the university.

Now, changes in the university have caused changes in the colleges, and the existence of the colleges has affected the course of change in the university. Some have been made directly by act of Parliament or by commissioners empowered by Parliament. Some have been made by formal acts of the university or of the several colleges. And some have come of themselves.

I explained before, how, by the original constitution of both universities, the supreme authority rested in a general assembly, convocation or senate, of all who had taken the highest degree in any faculty, that is, of every doctor and master who had kept his name on the books. But at Oxford the democratic character of this constitution had been broken down by the rule that

* THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, July, 1851.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing could be proposed to convocation which had not been approved by a body called the hebdomadal board; that is, the vice-chancellor, the two proctors, and the heads of colleges and halls. Convocation could only say yea and nay to their proposals, no amendment could be made, and all debate was in Latin. Here was the greatest encroachment made by the colleges on the university; for in the university constitution heads of colleges had no privilege over other doctors or masters. It was further objected that neither the hebdomadal board nor the convocation itself really represented the university. The heads, as being, except a few professors and canons, almost the only married men in the university, lived much among themselves, and knew little of what other people thought and felt. Convocation, meanwhile, largely consisted of non-residents. A measure of no great general interest was left to the resident members; but any exciting question, above all any theological question, drew up hundreds of men from all parts. It was said that many non-resident members of convocation were unfit to judge of university affairs, and that their votes often swamped those of the resident members. In truth the votes of many non-resident members were better worth having than the votes of many residents. But the lowering of the standard for degrees, and the giving of the higher degree at random to all who had taken the lower, had greatly lowered the character of convocation. Every doctor and master ought to be fit to judge of university matters, but every doctor and master was not.

Nothing has yet been done to remedy this last evil; but the constitution of the university has been improved in other ways. This was done by act of Parliament in 1854. The powers and constitution of convocation were left as they were; but the body that was to propose measures to it was changed. The new body, called the hebdomadal council, is mainly elective. Besides the chancellor, vice-chancellor, and proctors, eighteen members are chosen, six heads of houses, six professors or readers, while six may be members of convocation of any kind. These are chosen by a body called congregation, consisting of all resident or official members of convocation. And all statutes are first proposed by the council to congregation, which can not only accept or reject, but can make amendments and debate in English. When a statute has passed congregation, convocation still says

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yea or nay. The act meant to give the old congregation a new constitution and new power; but the lawyers said that the words used left the old congregation as it was, and set up a new congregation beside it in Oxford. So there are now two bodies called congregation, with different constitutions and different duties.

Much greater freedom of action is gained for the university in this change. The constitution of the council was doubtless meant to let the head down easily and to lift the professors up easily. After more than thirty years, the distinction is perhaps needless, and both heads and professors might be left to find their level. If any limitation is needed, a representation of faculties would be better. And the number of the council should be either larger or smaller. Nothing can be really debated in it, for the number is too large for conversation and too small for set speeches.

In another case the encroachments of the colleges on the university have been got rid of by abolishing the statute which required every member of the university to become a member of some college or hall. Men may now come, and do come in considerable numbers, who are members of the university only and not members of any college. For all university purposes they are on the same level as other members of the university; they simply use the advantages of a college life. And it is, of course, open to non-collegiate members of the university to obtain scholarships and fellowships in the colleges.

The colleges themselves have also been greatly changed, how far for the better is largely matter of opinion. Much will depend on the view which any man takes of the nature and duty of a college and of its relations to the university. It must be remembered that a college is in its origin simply a foundation to provide a dwelling and maintenance for certain students in the university. It is a *foundation*, not an *institution*. In making a foundation there was nothing unreasonable if the founder, in dispensing his bounty, gave a preference to those who came from some county or school in which he took a special interest. In a teaching institution restrictions of this kind must work badly. An inferior man might often be chosen when a better man might be had. Changes in the colleges have heretofore taken the direction of getting rid of restrictions and preferences of all kinds. Fellowships and scholarships have been thrown open; scholars have lost their claim or preference to fellowships. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number of fellowships has been greatly lessened. The nature and position of fellowships have also been greatly changed. They have ceased to be held for life. They are held for a term of years, or they have duties in college attached to them, or they are attached to offices in the university, as professorships. And in most cases marriage is allowed. Most of these changes would be undoubted improvements in a teaching college which stood by itself and not alongside of other colleges in an university.

Formerly a man was, first of all, a fellow of his college, a member of its foundation; he might or might not take on him the duties of a tutor. Now a man is made tutor, and he receives a fellowship as part payment of his work as tutor. And as married fellows cannot live in college, the tutor stands in a less close relation to his pupils than he used to stand. Scholarships, again, originally meant for students who could not come to the university without help, have sunk into rare prizes, given as rewards for cleverness in an examination, whether those who receive them have any need of them or not; or, rather, they are likely to be got by lads who have been specially prepared at expensive schools, while those for whom scholarships were meant have to come to the university how they can,—perhaps as non-collegiate students. In Oxford, as elsewhere, educational reform has largely meant taking from the poor to give to the rich.

In all these ways the colleges have forgotten their nature as *foundations* designed for the maintenance of students in the university, each foundation having something distinctive in its character and objects. They have become teaching institutions, all after the same model and doing the same work. Each strives to get as many under-graduates as it can, and to draw to it the most brilliant under-graduates by the offer of scholarships. The colleges have, in fact, become large boarding-schools, each of which undertakes to do the work of the university. The doubt therefore suggests itself whether the work of the university could not be better done by the university itself than by twenty and more distinct and independent institutions within it.

The second head is the relation of the universities to the nation at large. Here the chief point of change is the divergency of religious distinctions in the university and its colleges. The universities were not in their origin, as many people seem to think, what we should now call clerical institutions; they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were hardly ecclesiastical institutions. But at a time when the whole nation was of one religion, and when religion was mixed up with every action of life, they naturally grew up under religious influences. At a time when the thought that there could be more religious bodies than one in the nation had not come into any one's head, there was no conscious restriction to one religious body, to the exclusion of others. Divinity was naturally one of the studies, and among the highest, of the university. But there could be no formal restrictions to the Church of England till there were other religious bodies in the land besides the Church of England. At Oxford every student who matriculated was required to sign the Articles of Religion of the Church of England. The absurdity of making mere lads subscribe thirty-nine propositions in controversial theology need not be dwelled on. At Cambridge the subscription came at a late stage, so that a Non-conformist could be examined and could win honors in his examination, but could not take a degree. All this is now abolished. Everything, every degree and office, in both universities is open without distinction, except that degrees in divinity can be taken only by clergymen of the Church of England. And all university terms and other services are according to the use of the Church of England. This could hardly be otherwise, so long as a national church is acknowledged at all. But no one is bound to attend such services or is forbidden to attend any other.

The colleges, in their original foundation, were particularly more ecclesiastical than the university. They are in law lay corporations, and it may be well to remind every one once more that at no time was there anything monastic about them. But in foundations which were meant to be communities,—artificial families,—the religious element (in the modern sense of the word) was necessarily strong. The college chapel comes more home to men than the university church. In the minds of founders religion and learning always went together. But the strictly clerical element varied in different colleges; in some the fellows had to take holy orders sooner or later; in others they might all be laymen. At present there is no restriction on admission to the colleges and their foundations. Non-conformists and Jews have held scholarships and fellowships. Of clerical fellowships only a few are left to supply chaplains and theological teachers. Only two of the heads are under any restriction. The Rector of Lin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coln College is necessarily a clergyman. And at Christ Church, a very strong foundation, a body of students were attached to the cathedral chapel of the diocese. They were, therefore, under the sole management of the dean and canons. The governing body now consists of the dean and canons together with the students—answering nearly to the fellows of other colleges—on whom there is no restriction. There is also the new foundation of Hertford College, a rich college, and also the large hall called Keble College, both which have been founded strictly as Church of England institutions. It is equally possible to found Non-conformist halls or colleges. But it should be understood that Mansfield College and Manchester New College, Non-conformist institutions in Oxford, are not colleges in the old sense and have no connection with the University. But there is nothing whatever to hinder them from becoming halls or colleges.

Under the head of the relations of the universities to the nation at large might further come several schemes by which the universities send out examiners and lecturers to various places. The sending of lecturers, which must be good or bad accordingly as their lectures are good or bad, is called university extension, which has nothing to do with the constitution of the universities.

Our third subject is those studies themselves. In the old theory there was, besides arts, the three superior faculties of divinity, law, and medicine, to which none but graduates in arts were admitted. It is hard to define arts. We might say that it takes in whatever subjects are at any time held to be essential to a general, liberal education, as distinguished from the strictly professional faculties. What these subjects are will differ according to the ideas of different ages. The essential thing in any age is that they should be subjects which are good for every man; good for the general culture of the mind, without any reference to a man's special calling. An university is a place at once of special learning and of general training of the mind; it is assuredly not a place for each man to come to and there learn his own calling. The course for the first degree at all events should be preliminary, good for all, desirable first of all for the training of the mind; only in a secondary way for the sake of the actual knowledge gained in it. The study of special subjects should not come till this first foundation is laid. It follows that the age at which students come to the university should be the earliest at which they are able to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

benefit by the preliminary training. The first degree taken, a more special course may follow, at what is still an early time of life, and that should lead to the second, the master's degree.

Something like this was the old theory; but it was very imperfectly carried out, and it has not been thrown altogether aside. Fifty years back and less, the training given by the universities, the course for the first degree, was mainly what is called "classical" and mathematical. The details differed largely at Oxford and at Cambridge Universities; at Cambridge mathematics had a greater prominence than they had in Oxford, and the character of "classical" scholarship in the two was exactly the same. Cambridge, we may say, gave more attention to the minute knowledge of the "classical" languages, and Oxford more to the knowledge of the books written in them. The old system, in short, had a very good course as a preliminary course, and nothing could be better than the single searching examination for the bachelor's degree. The unlucky thing was, that it was sometimes forgotten that the course was only a preliminary course. The faults of the system were these:

First, The degradation of the common degree. A high class in the examination was well worth having; a pass degree, though better than nothing at all, was worth comparatively little.

Second, The absence of any further examination or exercise for the master's degree, which had become a matter of form. Hence many men, because they had got a good class for their bachelor's degree, were tempted to fancy that they already knew all that they needed to know, and became teachers at a stage when they should still have been learners.

Third, Even forty or fifty years back, men were beginning to come to the university later than was good for them, later than they had done at the beginning of the century.

The bill-of-reform needed was clear. For the first point, the standard of the bachelor's degree should have been raised, so as to be in itself respectable, and the wretched excitement of class-lists should have been got rid of. And more use should have been made than was made—or than could have been made fifty years back—of the great teachings of modern philology. For the second point, the master's degree should have been made to require real proficiency in some branch of knowledge, the wider the range of subjects the better. The master's degree would then become honor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able, and no one could any longer say that the general assembly of the university was an incompetent body. Thirdly, every encouragement should have been given to students to come early to the university, in order to have time for both their preliminary and their special course.

Instead of this, change has taken quite opposite directions. A very natural and reasonable cry for the introduction of other subjects into the arts course, besides "classics" and mathematics, has been met in a wrong way. Instead of keeping the old subjects preliminary, and putting the newer subjects into a separate course for the master's degree, a number of new subjects have been made alternative with old ones for the bachelor's degree.

Instead of keeping one preliminary course for all candidates for the bachelor's degree, every attempt has been made in these alternative courses specially to adapt different forms of them to particular classes of men. The crowning absurdity is the estabment of schools in law and theology, subjects which have their distinct faculties in the university, as alternative ways of getting a degree in the faculty of arts. The degree, the class, may now be had in endless different ways, so that it is impossible to know what each man's degree, or class, means. The one searching examination, which was a real test of real work, is exchanged for endless petty examinations in this and that, one after another, so that everybody seems to be always either examining or being examined, without any time for study, reading, or thought being left for either teacher or learner. For the master's degree nothing has been done; it is still given without distinction to all who can anyhow get the bachelor's degree. By all this, the temptation to men to fancy that they have learned everything, and to become teachers before their time has been strengthened. The notion of teaching and learning, without reference to examinations, is driven out of men's heads.

Again, the excessive attention to those subjects only which tell in examinations has done much to hinder the usefulness of the professors. Their business, as distinguished from that of the college rector, clearly is to teach those subjects which are not required for examination and the higher branches of those which are. Those who love learning for its own sake are always a minority, and with that minority the professors have to put up. The educational power at Oxford now lies mainly, neither with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

professors nor with colleges after the old pattern, nor yet with doctors and masters lecturing as such, according to a still older pattern. That is to say, a teacher belonging to one college lectures to men of several colleges or of all. If this arrangement is found convenient, it follows that the colleges, as separate teaching institutions, are no longer needed. They are attempting to do the work of the university, which ought to be done by some authority in the university.

Add to this, there are what are called boards of studies in each branch of examination. Of these the professors are *ex officio* members; but with these are joined others elected by the body of teachers in that branch. That body is defined to be all who are certified by the heads of their colleges to be teachers in that branch. That is to say, a young man who begins to teach when he ought to be still learning is, on the certificate perhaps of another young man no better qualified than himself, put on a level with the professor who is presumably a master of his subject. In the business done at these boards the professors have no vote or advantage beyond any lecturer of this kind; the professors have to send in their scheme of lectures for approval to the board then formed, and the lectures of the professors are announced confusedly with the lectures of the other lecturers. From the point of view of the advancement of learning comment seems hardly needed.

The associate class of teachers thus called into being, college officers, if anything, taking on themselves university functions, are mostly hard-working men. Their fault is rather that they work too hard, that they leave no time for themselves or their pupils to read or think. Some of them are really able men, who do good work as far as their position allows. But their position is a wrong one; they should be either professors or college tutors, not a confusion of the two. It is very remarkable that the best commission arose out of a movement for the advancement of learning as distinguished from examination, and for the recognition of the professors as the representatives of learning. The result has been the bondage and degradation of learning and of its professors. All this strangely suggests the question whether twenty and more independent institutions, as distinguished from their ancient nature as foundations, are not mischievous rather than useful in the university.

EDWARD A. FREEMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HAWAIIAN SITUATION.

I.—THE INVASION OF HAWAII.

BY EUGENE TYLER CHAMBERLAIN.

DANIEL WEBSTER, Secretary of State, on July 14, 1851, wrote to Luther Severance, representing the United States at Honolulu:

> "The Government of the United States was the first to acknowledge the national existence of the Hawaiian Government, and to treat with it as an independent state. Its example was soon followed by several of the Governments of Europe; and the United States, true to its treaty obligations, has in no case interfered with the Hawaiian Government for the purpose of opposing the course of its own independent conduct or of dictating to it any particular line of policy. In acknowledging the independence of the Islands, and of the Government established over them, it was not seeking to promote any peculiar object of its own. What it did, and all that it did, was done openly in the face of day, in entire good faith, and known to all nations. . . . But while thus indisposed to exercise any sinister influence itself over the counsels of Hawaii, or to overawe the proceedings of its Government by the menace or the actual application of superior military force, it expects to see other powerful nations act in the same spirit."

Mr. Webster went further, directing Mr. Severance to return to the Hawaiian Government an act of contingent surrender to the United States, placed in his hands by that Government, and specifically warned Mr. Severance against encouraging in any quarter the idea that the Islands would be annexed to the United States.

Up to January 16, 1893, the broad principles laid down in Mr. Webster's quoted words were not only the rule of conduct for the Government of the United States in its relations with the Government of Hawaii; but they were also recognized by those who desire, as well as by those who do not desire, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

annexation of the Hawaiian archipelago to this country. The state papers of Secretary Marcy and Secretary Blaine; and the published utterances of other distinguished citizens of the United States who have regarded annexation as the ultimate and desirable destiny of these islands of the Pacific, will be searched to no purpose for indications of a belief that annexation should be brought about otherwise than in fidelity to treaty obligations, "openly in the face of day, in entire good faith and known to all nations," and without the "menace or actual application of superior military force." A belief to the contrary is so repugnant to the traditions and temper of the American people, and so clearly involves adherence to the theory of insular colonial expansion by conquest, that one may safely assert it will find scant favor among the people of the United States.

The dethronement of Queen Liliuokalani and the establishment of an oligarchy on the island of Oahu, "until terms of union with the United States of America have been negotiated and agreed upon," were effected on the afternoon of Tuesday, January 17, 1893, in the presence of a considerable body of the naval forces of the United States, armed with Gatling guns, and stationed in the immediate vicinity and in plain sight of the Palace and Government Building, where the so-called revolution was consummated.

The local causes of this so-called revolution, remote and proximate, are relatively immaterial to the United States. They, with the general issue of annexation, dwindle before the question, What were the purpose and the effect of the presence of the forces of the United States in Honolulu on January the sixteenth and seventeenth?

The recognized government of a nation with which we were at peace had officially notified Minister Stevens, our representative, of its ability to preserve order and protect property. The Vice-Consul-General of the United States, Mr. W. Porter Boyd, testifies that no uneasiness was felt at the consulate, and that the landing of the troops was a complete surprise to him. All the signs of street life betokened good order, and, soon after the blue-jackets had trailed their artillery through the streets, the population of Honolulu was enjoying the regular Monday evening out-of-door concert of the Hawaiian Band. The landing of the troops was promptly followed by the protests of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the proper authorities of the kingdom and the island, transmitted officially to Minister Stevens. No evidence has been presented to Commissioner Blount to show that there was any apprehension or any desire for the presence ashore of the men of the "Boston" under arms, except on the part of the members of the Citizens' Committee of Safety. The matter was not referred to at the mass meeting of the foreign population, organized by that committee, and held but a few hours before the troops landed.

The Committee of Safety, at whose request Mr. Stevens summoned the troops, did not prefer that request as American citizens. It could not, for only five of its thirteen members owed allegiance to and were under the protection of the United States. By the admission of several of their own number to Mr. Blount, they were engaged in plotting secretly the overthrow of the government and the establishment of themselves in power until they could transfer the Islands to the United States, and Minister Stevens was in their full confidence at the time they asked for, and he ordered, the landing of the troops. They had been threatened with arrest by the government they planned to overthrow, and he had promised to protect them. The troops of the "Boston" were the only means he had of keeping good that promise, and he did not scruple to use them for it. But even to the thirteen engaged in the plot the danger of arrest was not so imminent as to deter them from requesting Mr. Stevens not to land the troops too soon for their purposes. Mr. W. O. Smith, the attorney-general of the Provisional Government and a leader in the committee, testifies that at a conference on Monday afternoon, at four o'clock, "our plans had not been perfected, our papers had not been completed, and, after a hasty discussion—the time being short—it was decided that it was impossible for us to take the necessary steps, and we should request that the troops be not landed until the next morning, the hour in the morning being immaterial—whether it was nine, eight, or six o'clock in the morning—but we must have further time to prevent bloodshed." Nevertheless the "Boston's" men landed at five o'clock, Mr. Stevens being apparently the only man on the Island of Oahu who deemed their presence necessary at that time.

To keep pace with Mr. Stevens' haste the Committee of Safety met secretly a few hours later and selected Judge

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sanford B. Dole as the civil head of their oligarchy, and Mr. John H. Soper, a citizen of the United States, as the head of its military forces, then in existence only in the imagination of the conclave. Mr. Soper admits that he did not agree to accept the command of the provisional "army" until he was assured that Minister Stevens would recognize the Provisional Government on Tuesday. On their part both Judge Dole and Minister Stevens apparently did not have entire confidence in the prowess of "General" Soper, as witness the following letter to Judge Dole the next day :

U. S. LEGATION, Jan. 17, 1893.

Think Captain Wiltse will endeavor to maintain order and protect life and property, but do not think he would take command of the men of the Provisional Government. Will have him come to the Legation soon as possible and take his opinion and inform you soon as possible.

Yours truly, JOHN L. STEVENS.

The purpose of the presence of the blue-jackets, in the minds of the committee that asked for it, is summed up in the admission of Judge Dole that when the troops were first furnished they could not have gotten along without their aid, and of Mr. Henry Waterhouse of the Committee :

"We knew the feeling of those who were in power then—that they were cowards—that by going up with a bold front and they supposing that the American troops would assist us, that would help us out."

The forces of the United States, thus brought ashore against the protest of a friendly Power, at the request of men engaged in a plot to overturn that Power, were stationed, remote from the residences of Americans, less than a hundred yards from the Government Building, designated by Minister Stevens as the place in which the Provisional Government should be established to secure his recognition, and in plain sight of the Queen's palace windows. Admiral Skerrett sums up the disposition of the forces thus :

"The American troops were well located if designed to promote the movement for the Provisional Government, and very improperly located if only intended to protect American citizens in person and property."

The Queen was dethroned and the oligarchy established by proclamation, read by a citizen of the United States, shortly before three o'clock, and recognized, in the name of the United States, by Minister Stevens before it was in possession of any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point held in force by the Queen's government. With more prudence Captain Wiltse, in command of the "Boston," declined to recognize it until it came into possession of the military posts of the Queen, as it did by her voluntary surrender of them early in the evening. Her surrender was in terms "to the superior force of the United States," and "until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representative," and on this understanding it was accepted by the junta.

On February 25, 1843, King Kamehameha III. ceded the Hawaiian Islands to Lord George Paulet under duress of the guns of Her Majesty's ship "Carysfort," subject to review by the government of Queen Victoria, and the British flag was raised over Honolulu. On July 31 of the same year Rear Admiral Richard Thomas, representing the Queen, declined to accept the cession, and recognized the King as the lawful sovereign of the Islands, stating that this act of restoration should be accepted by the King

"as a most powerful and convincing proof not only of the responsibility he is under to render immediate reparation for real wrongs committed upon British subjects or their property, but also of the importance which attaches to the maintenance of those friendly and reciprocally advantageous relations which have for so many years subsisted between the two nations."

The people of Hawaii have dedicated one of the public squares of Honolulu to the memory of this just and generous restoration of their national life.

The questions raised by Commissioner Blount's report—and the statement of facts given in these pages rests on the testimony of annexationists—take precedence of any question of territorial expansion. Through the action of their representative the United States were placed on January 16 and 17 in the position of armed invaders of a friendly state, giving countenance and moral support to a plot to overturn a Government, which could not otherwise have succeeded and would not otherwise have been attempted. The character of that Government does not enter into the question of the observance of our treaty obligations to it or into that consideration which is due to the weak from the strong in the mind of every American.

EUGENE TYLER CHAMBERLAIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.—A PLEA FOR ANNEXATION.

BY THE HON. JOHN L. STEVENS, RECENTLY UNITED STATES MINISTER TO HAWAII.

A GRAVE question is now before the American people, the wrong solution of which will deeply affect the moral standing of the United States before the world. Will the American nation stand by its century's record in favor of republican government and of free Christian civilization, or will it repudiate its past by using its power to murder its own offspring and to stamp out the reforming work of pure and noble men and women who have made the Hawaiian Islands what they are, thus following the once infamous example of the Austrian Hapsburgs in stifling the noble aspirations of Italy and Hungary. The facts and reasons given in the following article bear on the inquiry: Shall this Nation continue its policy towards Hawaii on the lines indicated by Marcy, Seward, Grant and Blaine, or shall it follow a different and uncertain path, endangering, if not disgracefully sacrificing, American prestige and American interests in the North Pacific?

When Cook first saw Hawaii, in 1778, he estimated the population at four hundred thousand. This undoubtedly was an exaggeration. The real numbers probably did not exceed two hundred and fifty thousand, and on the arrival of the American missionaries, in 1820, there were not more than one hundred and fifty thousand. This rapid reduction of the native population prior to the advent of the missionaries conclusively answers the charge that Christian instruction and Christian life were influential in decimating the native Hawaiians. There are reasons for the belief that this decrease of the race had already been operative before Cook's discovery, and that this earlier tendency to extinction has been augmented by the vices of men claiming to be civilized, while more hostile to Christian efforts than the original barbarians. The reduction has gone on consecutively from the two hundred and fifty thousand in the time of Cook to the thirty-four thousand at the present date.

Nothing more conclusively than these figures proves that the future of the Islands must be controlled by other than the native race. These beautiful and sunny isles, with their rich resources and splendid future possibilities, must and will be improved and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

governed by an intelligent and powerful race. While the surviving natives should be most kindly dealt with, allowed every possible opportunity to improve their condition and help themselves, it would be throwing to the winds all past experience and historical instruction to think longer of governing the Islands by the native race which comprises about one-third of the population. The native monarchy was continued twenty years after the seeds of death were in its members. The Kamehameha race of kings, who reigned ninety years, became extinct in 1874. During the most of that period the natives constituted a very large majority of the population, and most of the kings of that dynasty had more or less ability and tried to rule for the welfare of their people. The monarchy then rested on a logical foundation. There were numerous chiefs subordinate to the king, and the mass of the population when the missionaries arrived among them were in abject servile subjection to the king and chiefs, who held the land, fishing rights, and timber, the chief property of the Islands. Thus there was a kind of feudal system on which the monarchy rested, somewhat analogous to the foundation on which European monarchies were long maintained.

The missionaries who began their labors there in 1820 were no ordinary men. They were clergymen, teachers and physicians. The native monarch had enough natural sense to perceive the value of their intelligent assistance. These missionaries were obliged to deal with men and things as they found them. They obtained a healthy influence over the king and chiefs. By unwearied efforts, in the progress of time and events, a tolerable native monarchy was established and a full code of laws—mostly of American type—was enacted and put in force, and the American school system inaugurated. No other kind of government was then practicable. This state of things went on until 1874, when the Kamehameha race of kings became extinct by death. In the meanwhile the chiefs and their families had nearly all passed to their graves. Thus the logical foundation of the monarchy—the Hawaiian feudal system—no longer existed. Who should fill the vacant throne? This the Legislature decided by the election of David Kalakaua, the American influence being exerted in his support in preference to another candidate with British sympathies and affiliations. A large number of native Hawaiians, stirred up by irresponsible white men, re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sisted this election, drove the Legislature from its hall of assemblage, and created a formidable riot. Soldiers and sailors were landed from the United States vessels then in the harbor of Honolulu, and the riot was suppressed,—thus, in effect, this elected king was secured on the throne by American influence.

It did not take long to prove Kalakaua's utter unfitness as a ruler. Weak, good-natured and dissolute, he soon drew around him men and women of like character, and the influence of himself and favorites was very deleterious to private and public morals throughout the Islands, especially among the natives. Reckless in expenditures, greedy of gain to gratify his vicious tastes and to feed his unworthy favorites, he was a fitting tool of those who knew how to make use of the semi-barbarous king to their pecuniary advantage, and who openly boasted of their dictatorial powers at the Hawaiian palace. Instead of drawing around him the best men, as his Kamehameha predecessors had often done, he fell into the hands of irresponsible adventurers. This continued to such an increased degree as to bring its culmination in 1887, when all the respectable and responsible men of the Islands were obliged to take decisive action. Kalakaua had then been for several years chiefly under the control of one Gibson, an American by birth, who went to Hawaii as a Mormon missionary, gained political power by stirring up the native Hawaiians against the white citizens, raising the cry of "Hawaii for the Hawaiians." He became the king's chief minister, and soon completely dominated him and the rest of the cabinet.

The incidental event which finally precipitated the revolution of 1887 was the king's taking a bribe of seventy thousand dollars in gold for a license to sell opium in the Islands. This gold was carried in bags to the palace, and expended by the king for his personal uses. The king then sold the license to another party for a larger sum and did not return the seventy thousand dollars to the first purchaser. Though the Islands were then exceedingly prosperous, the taxes and expenses were so largely increased by worse than useless expenditures and official corruption, that the taxpayers had no alternative but to take decisive measures. They organized and armed, and with united voice demanded the dismissal of Gibson, the establishment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a new constitution taking from the king much of the power which he had so abused, and the creation of a Ministry responsible to a majority of the legislature. Finding himself powerless to withstand this just demand of the principal citizens of the Island, the king yielded, removed Gibson from his office, and consented to the appointment of a Reform Ministry, three of them being from the best men of the Islands, two of them born in Hawaii of sturdy American stock and thoroughly American in ideas and sympathies.

At the time of this uprising in 1887 many wished to abolish the monarchy at once. But the more conservative said: "Let the monarchy be tried once more under new restrictions." Many of the American residents, especially those of the old missionary stock, were tender and forbearing towards the native rulers and disliked to assent to extreme measures, so long as there was a possibility of getting on with a native monarchy. The more resolute and radical reformers yielded to the views of the conservatives. Every careful observer of the circumstances then saw clearly that should the monarchy again fall into the hands of adventurers and repeat its imbecility and corruption, it could not survive. While Kalakaua was facile and good natured, he had never assented to the new constitution in good faith. He sought opportunities to change it and to regain his lost power. When he died in January, 1890, his sister Liliuokalani by his appointment became the sovereign. Liliuokalani had strongly disapproved of her brother's assent to the reform constitution of 1887. She was known to have been in the Wilcox plot, the armed revolt of 1889, for the overthrow of the constitutional government. Incapable of ruling, self willed to extreme obstinacy, she soon fell into the hands of the unworthy, openly defying public and private morals.

Scorning the opinions and advice of all the best men of the Islands, both of her own race and the whites, she finally united her political fortunes with the opium ring and those who were leagued to carry through the Legislature a sweeping lottery charter of the Louisiana type, which, if its originators could have been successful in their plans, would have given the palace adventurers, the opium ring, and the lottery gang, complete control of the Hawaiian government, and made Honolulu not only a secure opium depot, but a strong fortress from which the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lottery men could play on the American, Canadian, and Australian people. Deep in the conspiracy to remove the Wilcox-Jones Ministry, whom all the best men of the Islands wished to continue, she signed the lottery and opium bills, appointed to her Cabinet the men who had been the chief parties in bribing the lottery bill through the Legislature, and followed this with an attempted *coup d'etat*, calling a worthless mob of retainers to her assistance, trying to proclaim a constitution giving herself arbitrary power, overturning an incorruptible Supreme Court, and giving to herself the appointment of new judges. This was Saturday, January 14, 1893. From that hour the Hawaiian monarchy was dead, and no restoration is possible, except by the exercise of some outside and foreign force. At the date of her downfall Liliuokalani was without the sympathy and aid of the best of the native Hawaiians and of nearly all the respectable and responsible white residents of the Islands.

Amid the exciting events in Honolulu following the revolutionary attempts of Liliuokalani to proclaim a despotic constitution, by which she flung away her crown, a small force of marines and sailors was landed from the United States ship "Boston," as a precautionary step for the protection of American life and property, and as a safeguard against night incendiarism stimulated by the hope of plunder, greatly feared by many of the best citizens. This was doing precisely what had been repeatedly done in previous exciting days in Honolulu, during a period running back many years. The men of the "Boston" came on shore nearly fifty hours after the fall of the queen, in whose defence no effective aid was offered by those who had surrounded her in her carnival of immorality and official corruption. The naval commander and the United States Minister earnestly sought to faithfully carry out the prior rules of the Legation, especially those contained in the last instructions issued to the United States Minister and naval commander, by Secretary Bayard, July 12, 1887. Neither by force, threats, nor intimidation, did the United States officials oppose the fallen queen or aid the Provisional Government, the latter being supported by the same men, with now increased numbers, who found it imperatively necessary to take despotic power from King Kalakaua in 1887, by the adoption of the reformed constitution, and who crushed out the Wilcox rebellion in 1889. All asser-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions to the contrary as to the action of the United States officials and marines are absolutely untrue and certain to be swept aside by time and history, however plausibly stated and however strongly these assertions may be supported by the perjured testimony of persons deeply compromised by the vices and unlawful actions of which they had been guilty before Liliuokalani lost her throne.

The Hawaiian monarchy being thus extinct, and the Hawaiian Islands being not sufficient to constitute an independent nation, all who really understand their situation know that good government is now the first and imperative need. Such being the fact, they apply for admission to the American Union as a Territory. Their best and now controlling citizens do not wish to be admitted as a State. By property interests, commercial association, by school and political education, by the general prevalence of American laws, legal decisions, social and religious ideas, these Islands have become thorougly Americanized. Go into the Chamber of Commerce, into the principal churches, into the courts, into the schools of Honolulu, Hilo, and other chief towns in the Islands, and you would think yourself in New England or western New York. American ideas and interests are all dominant. For sixty years the Islands have had the American school system. American superintendents and teachers have had the chief management of these schools in all these years, and English is now the chief language taught in them. At the head of the Protestant College at Honolulu is an American president, and the principal professors are Americans. In the Catholic college the professors are chiefly from the United States and are strongly American in sentiment. The Kamehameha Industrial School, to establish which an American and his native wife, a woman of inteligence and excellent character, now deceased, have given nearly seven hundred thousand dollars, which has been in successful operation for years, where the native boys obtain an intellectual training and learn the various mechanical trades, has an entire corps of American teachers. The city High-School, admirably managed, has a superior American teacher at its head. The two principal daily newspapers are edited, owned, and published by Americans. The principal lawyers at the bar and on the bench are Americans, born on the Islands of American parentage or in the United States, and educated in American colleges. More

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than eighty per cent. of the trade, amounting to more than twenty million dollars per year, is with the United States. American newspapers, magazines, and books are in as familiar use in the Islands as in the United States. A striking proof of the deeply rooted American feeling and opinions is evinced by the celebration of the Fourth of July, which is done with an enthusiasm similar to what was shown among us on our great national day fifty years ago.

In presenting themselves for admission into the American Union the Islands come under more American aspects than any of our previously annexed States or Territories. A recent writer in an American magazine, a man of European birth and education, and of more or less sympathy with his fatherland, objects to the annexation of the Islands for the reason that there were, in 1890, but 1,928 Americans living upon them. He is evidently unacquainted with the real facts, else he carelessly allows his language to state a truth in a way to utter an untruth. It is true that, according to the census of 1890, there were then but about two thousand persons residing in Hawaii who were born in the United States. But in addition to these a large proportion of the 7,500 born on the Islands, of foreign parentage, and put down as Hawaiians, are of American parentage, and they form an important part of the American colony. They were educated in American ideas and sentiments, their leading men being graduates of American colleges. Some of these served in the Union army, suffered in Southern prisons, bear on their persons honorable scars, or sleep in graves redolent of American patriotism. I have seen some of these men on Decoration Day march through the streets of Honolulu, from their Grand Army Post, to the beautiful cemetery where a goodly number of their comrades are buried, amid tokens of public respect not surpassed in any of our American cities. One of the dead heroes, born in Honolulu, of an American father and mother, who did long and noble service to rescue the Islands from barbarism and to save them from hostile European domination, was General Armstrong, who for many years served this country so devotedly in the great educational work for colored men at Hampton, and who not long before his lamented death made a powerful plea to Americans to stand by Hawaii in her American aspirations. Who assumes to say that these men have not the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

right to ask to come under the American flag? What they now ask to do is what forty years ago Secretary Marcy, of the then existing Democratic administration, asked them to do; they are now ready to accept.

But what of the twelve thousand of the European-born residents of Hawaii—Germans, Scandinavians, English, Portuguese. Most of them are Americanized and wish for annexation. Their chief business relations are with the United States, their children are educated in the American-Hawaiian schools, and are as thoroughly American as our own adopted citizens. The Portuguese, numbering about 9,000, are unanimous in their strong sympathies with us. Their children are educated in American schools, and receive American ideas with remarkable alacrity. The reasons are obvious why they are a unit for annexation. All the best of the native Hawaiians are in the same way of thinking. But it may be said that the Chinese and Japanese population are objectionable. I need not say that a large majority of these are not permanent residents of the Islands, being temporarily employed on the plantations, intending to return home, according to the stipulations of their contract, when their term of service shall have been completed.

A paramount reason why annexation should not be long postponed is that, if it soon takes place, the crown and government lands will be cut up and sold to American and Christian Caucasian people, thus preventing the Islands from being submerged and overrun by Asiatics, putting an end to Japanese ambitions stimulated by our strong European rival.

It is strictly correct and just to call those who now support the Provisional Government in Hawaii an American colony. England, Germany, France, Holland, and Spain—the chief European nations which long have had colonial possessions—have not on the earth colonies more decisively their own than that which the United States possesses in Hawaii. By the foresight and generous contributions of the American Board of Missions, by the intelligence and devoted labors of those it sent to the Islands, and the encouraging policy of the American Government for sixty years, these Islands have been won from heathen barbarism and their population imbued with American ideas. In the faith that some day they would come under the flag of the land of their fathers, the sons and grandsons of American missionaries,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teachers, physicians, and merchants, now supporting the cause of annexation, have been reared. A more patriotic body of Americans does not exist. Shall we break faith with them now? Shall we place them at the mercy of stupendous corruption available to our national rivals? To do so would be to press the brand of shame on the noble and expansive brow of the American Republic. It would be a piece of infamy of which no great nation has ever been guilty, to look coldly on and see an American colony standing with a spotless record on those beautiful Islands, the advanced post of American civilization, struck down by a league of foreign adventurers, gamblers and national enemies. It would justly bring on us the moral opprobrium of the world.

There is not space allowed me in this article to speak of the vast importance of Hawaii to the future commercial power of the United States in the Pacific. Consider what it implies that this nation possesses four thousand miles of shore line on that mighty ocean, not including the seventeen hundred miles on that marvellous body of water, Puget Sound. Consider that two-fifths of this great country outlets on the Pacific, now reached by five trans-continental lines of railroad. Consider that there are those now already born in the United States who will live to see our population number two hundred and fifty millions of souls, with manufactures amounting to thousands of millions of dollars per annum, which must have an outlet wherever American enterprise and the American flag shall hold a commanding position. Consider that, in the opinion of all naval and commercial experts, Hawaii with its Pearl Harbor is the key to the North Pacific, which is the waterway over which five hundred millions of people, at no distant day, will make their traffic. Consider that all the great statesmen of America, from the days of John Quincy Adams to this date, have desired and looked forward to Americanizing and acquiring this splendid ocean possession, now offered to us without the cost of a single dollar or a single life.

But it is said that Hawaii is not contiguous territory. It is as much so as our Alaska land, whose immense value the genius of Seward and Sumner foresaw. It should not be forgotten that contiguity of water is sometimes more important than contiguity of land. It would be well if some of our public men would carefully study the remarkable work of Captain Mahan on "Sea

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Power." Why did Peter the Great of Russia, the ablest monarch of his century, wrestle with such tremendous energy for dominancy of the Baltic? Why did Gustavus Adolphus, perhaps the ablest ruler of the seventeenth century, contend with such skill and bravery to secure the power of Sweden on the same northern sea? These remarkable men saw clearly the supreme value of contiguity of water to their respective countries. Why do France and Italy attach supreme importance to their influence on the Mediterranean, to secure which they have expended vast sums of money, and shed freely of their people's blood? Because they have believed, for the best of reasons, that the contiguity of that sea to their cities and harbors is invaluable to them.

To say that we do not need the Hawaiian Islands as a security to our immense future interests is but the babble of children or of incompetent men. It is blindly and recklessly to ignore the logic of irresistible circumstances, and to scoff at the plainest teachings of history. No! America cannot get rid of her future responsibilities if she would, and all attempts to do so will be at the cost of her future generations. In the light of these inexorable truths, in the name of what is most sacred in Christian civilization, in behalf of a noble American colony, holding the advanced post of America's progress, I cherish the faith that the American people, the American statesmen, and the American government, thoughtful of America's great future, will settle the Hawaiian question wisely and well—will see to it that the flag of the United States floats unmolested over the Hawaiian Islands.

JOHN L. STEVENS.

III.—OUR PRESENT DUTY.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER.

In the complications which have arisen recently in the Hawaiian Islands a few residents, prompted by their personal interests, nearly all of whom are of foreign birth and many of whom are aliens, have sought to embroil our government in the internal affairs of a peaceful, but feeble nation. The pretext for this intervention is based upon the alleged fact that the government of the queen of the Hawaiian Islands was a "semi-barbaric mon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

archy resting on no solid or moral foundation, dead in everything but its vices, coarsely luxurious in its tastes and wishes, constantly sending out impure exhalations, and spreading social and political demoralization throughout the islands." This is the indictment against the monarchy made by the late minister, Mr. Stevens, who, after leaving the islands, further assails the government to which he was so recently accredited as a diplomatic representative, by charging that the queen has sustained scandalous and immoral relations with one of her ministers. This being the alleged condition of the government of Hawaii, an appeal is made to the moral sentiment of the American people to justify the overthrow of that government and establish in its stead what its friends and supporters have denominated "a Christian government," by which we may assume, is meant a government whose administrators profess the Christian religion.

The provisional government which was established had no other foundation for its existence than what is called "the great mass meeting of January 16," at which the whole attendance did not exceed sixteen hundred persons. At this meeting a committee of public safety was appointed, which committee "proclaimed" a provisional government. This provisional government was not even submitted to the town meeting for its approval. It could not have maintained an existence for an hour had it not been for the fact that the marine forces on board the United States steamship "Boston", then lying in the harbor, were, at the request of the committee of public safety and the American minister, landed, and were stationed at such points as the American minister, acting in conjunction with the provisional government, directed. These armed forces of the United States remained on shore in Honolulu for seventy-five days, and thus this remarkable revolution in the Hawaiian Islands was accomplished. The government of Hawaii, whatever may have been its faults, was not founded upon bayonets, the whole number of the armed forces of the queen being less than one hundred, a mere police or constabulary force for maintaining law and order in and about the public buildings in the city of Honolulu. The local government was overpowered by the mere presence of the United States troops. The queen states, in her appeal to the President of the United States, that she surrendered to the superior forces of this government in order to avoid unnecessary conflict, and trusting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the justice of our government, when all the facts shall be known, to reinstate her in her rightful position.

Whether the government of Hawaii was a just one, a moral one, or an efficient one, is a matter which does not concern the American people. We have no more right to overthrow a monarchy in Hawaii because it does not conform to our ideas of a just government, than we have to overthrow a monarchy in Canada or Great Britain, or Russia or Turkey, or Spain or elsewhere.

But it is alleged that the presence of the United States forces on shore was necessary to the protection of American life and property. This claim can only be supported upon the assumption that American citizens were actually in danger in their persons and in their property while peacefully pursuing their business there. If American citizens were interfering with the local government and using their influence to overthrow it, they had no right to claim the protection of American forces in this unlawful and revolutionary procedure. If they were peaceable and obeying the local law they were in no danger whatever. There is not an allegation that one of the subjects of Great Britain or of France or Germany or of China or Japan or of any other government required the interposition of the armed forces of their governments for their protection, or that the property of these subjects of such governments was in any way endangered by anything that was being done at the time. It is passing strange if ours were the only foreign citizens who were endangered in their lives or their property. If the citizens of the United States who were in Honolulu at the time had been minding their own business and had kept their hands out of the affairs of the local government, they would no more have been in danger of their lives and property than were the citizens and subjects of other governments. Besides this, what injury could a weak and defenceless government, such as that of Hawaii, have inflicted upon the citizens of the United States, when all the armed forces of the monarchy did not exceed a hundred persons all told? Therefore the claim that the lives or property of American citizens were in danger is a mere pretext, having no foundation whatever in fact.

The people of the United States are not responsible for the kind of government that may be in existence in the Hawaiian Islands. Nor is it any of their concern as to whether that government deals justly with its citizens and subjects or not.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whether the government of Hawaii is a good government or a just government is a matter for the people of that island to determine for themselves. There is no divine right of republicanism in this world, any more than there is a divine right of kings. The divinity in all these matters is in the right of the people to govern themselves.

In this connection it is worthy of remark that the American minister, Mr. Blount, in his report to this government, summarized by Secretary Gresham, states that while at Honolulu he did not meet a single annexationist who expressed a willingness to submit the question of annexation to a vote of the people, nor did he talk with one on that subject who did not insist that if the Islands were annexed to the United States, suffrage should be so restricted as to give complete control to foreigners or white persons. I have, myself, on several occasions, conversed with those representing the provisional government in Washington upon this very point, and I inquired especially of them why means were not taken to submit the question to the people of Hawaii as to whether they desired to maintain the provisional government or to be annexed to the United States. In every instance I was informed that the people of the islands were not capable of self-government, and if the question were submitted to them that they would be hostile to this movement. The fact is that the people of Hawaii have never been consulted upon this subject. The so-called provisional government did not emanate from them, and does not have their sanction. It is a usurpation, which could not have had any *de facto* existence, to say nothing of a rightful existence, except for the presence of the overpowering armed forces of the United States. What right has a provisional government, thus established, to make a treaty with the government of the United States for the annexation of those islands to our government? Who has clothed this provisional government with authority to speak for the people they pretend to represent?

Our own right to self-government is no more sacred than the right of the handful of ignorant Hawaiians in the Sandwich Islands to govern themselves. If they prefer a monarchy, feeble and inefficient though it may be, it is their business, and not ours. But it is claimed that the provisional government is one composed of Christians, and that they are representatives of advanced Christian civilization. The United States, being a Christian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation, should sympathize with and render moral and material aid in sustaining that government; and it is alleged that we have no right to consent to its overthrow. It may be conceded, for the sake of argument, that the provisional government is composed of Christians, and that it more nearly corresponds to our ideas of a just government than does the government of the monarchy, but, as suggested before, this is foreign to the controversy. We have no more right to interfere on this ground with the government of Hawaii than we have to interfere with the government of China or Japan or Turkey, none of which are Christian or administered by Christian statesmen, and none of which, we have a right to assume, are any more just to the subjects of such government than is the monarchy of Hawaii to its subjects.

Such a claim would make the United States the moral and religious arbiter of the world; would constitute us self-appointed crusaders, going about the earth pulling down and destroying alleged heathen and semi-barbaric monarchies, and establishing Christian governments and civilization in their stead. This is not the mission of our government. If we have any concern as to the imperfection of these so-called barbaric governments, we may send our missionaries to them to convert them to our religion or send our statesmen among them to convince them of the superior advantages of our form of government. But to send our naval forces to the ports of other governments, to land them upon their soil, and allow them to be used for the purpose of overthrowing, in connection with foreign-born subjects or aliens, the established government, would make our Christianity a fraud and our boasted republicanism a mockery. Who would suppose for a moment that our government would have permitted such an intervention in the affairs of an island or dependence of Great Britain, or in any province owing allegiance to Great Britain, or to any other powerful government? We would not dare to assume such a rôle. It would be regarded as a declaration of war, and we would be compelled to withdraw our forces and apologize for our intervention.

The question is frequently asked in partisan papers, "How can the monarchy be restored?" or, "By what right does the government of the United States assume to reëstablish a monarchy which has been overthrown?" The government of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States has no more right to establish a monarchy in Hawaii than it has to establish one in Mexico or in Central America. But it is the duty of the United States Government, when its agents and representatives have committed a wrong against the government of a friendly power, to redress that wrong, and in this case it can only be accomplished by placing the government in *statu quo*, or in the condition in which it was found at the time the armed forces of the United States were landed upon Hawaiian soil, and interposed in the local affairs of the monarchy. We cannot redress the wrong we have committed by merely withdrawing our forces, after they have been used for seventy-five days to suppress the existing government and establish a provisional government in its stead. We must restore to the queen her own armed forces and we must disarm the forces of the provisional government which were armed and equipped by the aid and under the protection of our navies. Anything short of this is a mockery of justice, a disgrace to our diplomacy, is unworthy of a Christian nation, and a travesty upon our devotion to the principles of local self-government.

If the restoration of the *status quo*, which existed prior to the landing of our forces on Hawaiian soil, should result in the restoration of the monarchy, such restoration would only demonstrate the fact that the overthrow of the monarchy was due to our intervention. If it does not result in a restoration of the monarchy, then we have washed our hands of responsibility in the matter, and have vindicated the integrity of our diplomacy and the high character of our government as one which loves justice and maintains international comity. Therefore it is not the restoration of the monarchy which is in issue, but it is the restoration of the condition which existed prior to the armed intervention of the United States. Justice requires that our government should go back thus far, and when we have thus done justice we are not responsible for the injustice that others may do. We must maintain our integrity as a nation. We must vindicate our regard for the rights of a weak and defenceless government.

One other matter is worthy of consideration, and upon that there is room for honest differences of opinion. Is it desirable that the Hawaiian Islands should be annexed to the United States? What would result from annexation? The so-called treaty which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was submitted by the provisional government to the late administration of President Harrison and the Senate for its consideration, provided that our government should assume the debts of the monarchy and should grant a pension to the deposed Queen and to some members of her family. In the event of annexation the inhabitants of the islands would become citizens of the United States, unless they chose to expatriate themselves, or to continue as the subjects of a foreign government. The native Hawaiians would become citizens of the United States. They would have no place else to go for a home or for a domicile. They are ignorant of our laws, and of our institutions, and are incapable of self-government under a system such as that which we have in the United States. The laws which would be passed especially for government of the islands would be passed by the Congress of the United States and all general laws and the constitution of the United States would be over them as over other points of the United States. Laws which would be passed at Washington to govern a people who had no representation whatever in the law-making power, would have as little regard for the wishes of the people as would the laws imposed upon them by the monarchical form of government. In neither case would the people have anything to do with the making of the laws which should govern. There would be serious objections to permitting the admission of the islands into the Union as a State with two Senators and a Representative in Congress. Their civilization, their habits, their ideas of government will not assimilate with our institutions and we do not need the aid of the representatives of such a government in the councils of the nation to assist us in the solution of the governmental problems with which our people have to contend. Annexation therefore is of very doubtful expediency.

What is desirable so far as these islands are concerned, and what is the interest of the United States in reference to them? It seems to me that our true interests lie in the direction of a neutral and independent government of the Hawaiian Islands —a government for which we would not be responsible and which would not entitle its citizens to the protection of the government of the United States. Let them govern themselves in their own way, and as our government should maintain a neutrality as to the local government of Hawaii we should insist that all other governments should maintain like neutrality and like

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

non-intervention. The example which President Cleveland's administration has set in reference to these islands will enable us to successfully insist that other nations shall maintain a like policy. We should regard the seizure of the government of Hawaii by any other power as *casus belli* and resist it accordingly. The neutrality and independence of Hawaii as to all other governments is the policy which should be maintained and insisted upon by our government. We need those islands as a coaling station for our merchant marine and our vessels of war. We need them as harbors of refuge for our commerce upon the seas. We need them as places for meeting and exchanging on the high seas our products with the products of other countries. So long as these privileges are granted to us we have no right to object to like privileges being granted to other governments. Hence it is of the highest importance to the commerce of the world and to the peace of nations that the Sandwich Islands should be guaranteed by all governments a separate and independent existence, whose advantages should be shared alike by all the nations of the world, and which should, under no circumstances, be appropriated to the exclusive use of any one of them. As believers in the superiority and efficacy of republican institutions, as compared with monarchical, we may indulge the hope that the example of our own government and the advantages of our civilization may soon induce the people of Hawaii, acting upon their own judgment and desiring to promote their own interests, to suppress their monarchy and establish in its place a republican form of government. This will require time and the education of the masses. In the near future the education necessary to fit that people for self-government will be attained. It is education and not armed intervention that will bring about the reformation which every American citizen should desire.

WILLIAM M. SPRINGER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

NEW YORK TENEMENTS.

NEW YORK is breeding a mob in her tenements; a mob that, so far docile, will some time rise, unless its wrongs are righted, and right them for itself. Three-fourths of New York's population live in tenements, and one-half in tenements of such unhappy character that their baleful influence cannot help but be marked upon their crowds—domiciles so overcrowded that on their doorways might be tacked this paraphrase, "All ye who enter here, leave decency behind"; where only the rent and the death rate are high, and the standards of virtue, cleanliness and comfort are so low as to scarcely merit consideration; where self respect—the salvation of the human creature—may be said to reach the vanishing point.

There are in New York 34,967 front tenements and 2,391 rear tenements, with population given by the Board of Health as 276,565 families, composed of 1,225,411 individuals. The total population of the city is 1,513,501. Six small downtown wards may with confidence be spoken of as forming the most crowded spot on earth. No obtainable statistics of English or continental cities show a population approaching that of this district of New York. Nowhere else on the face of the globe are human beings packed together in such compact layers; nowhere are there so many of the layers.

The district is in shape an irregular square, bounded on the north by Fourteenth street, on the east and south by the East River and on the west by the Bowery and Fourth Avenue, with an addition of a few swarming acres extending thence between Houston and Canal streets to Broadway. It embraces scarcely one twenty-fifth of the whole city's area, but it furnishes "homes" for nearly one quarter of the city's population, and, incidentally, provides 10,000 yearly of the city's 40,000 deaths. An official also credits it with supplying the raw material for eighty per cent. of Gotham's criminals.

The population per square mile of these six wards was given in 1890 as:

Seventh	197,200	Thirteenth	295,104
Tenth	357,888	Fourtdenth	198,272
Eleventh	262,720	Seventeenth	252,834

This is an average for the whole district of 252,834 to the square mile.

Even the lowest of these figures shows a higher population than occurs anywhere else; and the population of the Tenth Ward to any given area is more than twice that credited to the most thickly populated district of Old London, where 175,816 people to the square mile dwell, and have been comparatively comfortable. Several continental cities contain more tightly crowded districts than London ever did, but none approaches the terrifying congestion of our "teeming Tenth."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Divide the area of that ward among its inhabitants, and each one has 8.6 square feet, or less than a square yard of ground space. The smallest toddler in the ward could not swing his arms in such a compass without assault upon his neighbor. Divide all six wards in a similar fashion, apportioning the total of inhabitants among them equally, and each person would have one and one-half square yards to turn around in if he could. So, then, if all these people were arrayed in marching order on a parade ground equal in area to the space they live in, their ranks would lack but little of being as tightly closed as those of an army in condition for battle.

There are among these tenements, besides a class that would be intelligent and respectable if they could, the offscourings of almost every nation under the sun. Whether our immigration laws be wise or foolish, this is their result, and it adds a new complication to the puzzle of the tenements. Nineteen languages and dialects are among the accomplishments of a furniture firm's collector who does business wholly in these wards, and sometimes he is forced to call for an interpreter! So New York's tenements are not only the worst crowded; their crowds are the most intricate and difficult to deal with. A worker among them must have a new method for almost every block.

As far back as 1864, when the highest population of the tenements had reached the ratio of 290,000 to the square mile, the gravity of the problem received spasmodic recognition. A citizens' committee, frightened by the prospects of a plague, had investigated those districts which they called "the slums," and the poor called "home." They found the sanitary conditions vile, and recommendations for health laws (practically the first we had) were made to the legislature. These were acted upon, but so tardily that the evil bore its fruit of cholera and smallpox first. This delayed operations until 1869. Then the newly organized Board of Health ordered the cutting of 46,000 windows in wholly dark and unventilated rooms within a twelvemonth, and when 1874 came, the Board had closed 550 cellars south of Houston Street, many of which were below tidewater, and had hitherto been jointly tenanted by hogs and human beings.

The "Tenement House Act" of 1867 satisfied the city until 1879-80, when a new step towards improvement was made through the tireless efforts of a few, led by Felix Adler. It was found impossible to arouse much interest in the matter, however, and only a few additions to the tenement house laws were the result. In the meantime, private philanthropy had done something by the erection of a few "model tenements," and individuals have worked patiently and earnestly, but without concerted effort, since then. And that is all; and that is almost nothing. Sanitary laws have reduced the death rate of the tenements, thus protecting the more prosperous portion of the community from tenement-born plague, but it is an open question if a low death rate, other things being as they are, is a blessing to the tenements themselves.

Thus New York, confronted in its tenements with the gravest danger of the sort that ever perilled a community, has taken no steps to eradicate it. What has been done has been defensive, never aggressive. In this neglect this city stands alone, and thus mocks its own pretensions to the van of progress. Every great centre of population in "effete and backward Europe" has done more. London cleared at one time forty-two acres at a net cost of £1,211,336; at another time 111,000 square feet, with an expenditure of £270,000. In Liverpool, 20,720 square yards in one of the worst

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

districts were purchased for £67,000. Edinburgh dispossessed 1,500 families from grossly imperfect dwellings at a cost of $3,505,000. Glasgow cleared and largely rebuilt eighty-eight acres. Birmingham bought and brought about the improvement of her forty-three worst acres. And so the European record goes. Paris, Berlin, even Hamburg, Cologne, and Buda Pesth have done much. New York, with all its boasting, has done nothing.

I have for three months been carrying on an investigation of the tenements, principally in the six wards specified. This examination has included a cellar-to-garret search of 319 or more buildings selected at random as typical, and a study of the people in them—their moral, mental and financial condition. The result has been an appalling revelation of extortion, overcrowding, immorality and filth. Our notoriously corrupt political system, the ever occurring and ever inadequately answered plea for education, the question of religious advancement, the liquor puzzle, even crime—in all its branches, not omitting the social evil—sink into insignificance before the problem of the housing of the poor, for that includes them all.

The first phase of the investigation concerned rents. Of all real estate in New York, tenement property pays the highest profits. Business buildings and high class residences and apartment houses here yield yearly from 4½ to 6 per cent. The latter is considered high. The ordinary tenement pays 10 per cent., and I have found houses which return a profit of 20, 23 and 25 per cent. on a reasonable estimate of their actual worth (not their market price,) based on their assessed valuations. I am assured by real estate agents that profits of 100 per cent. are not unknown. Only buildings used for illegal purposes pay a higher profit than tenements, and there is a row of houses of the former class in one street which actually yields proportionately lower rentals than do tenement houses not further than two blocks away. One of the finest apartment houses in the country, in which elevators, electric lights, service and other conveniences are furnished to its tenants, costs them yearly 37⅝ cents per square foot. A dirty, ill ventilated and rickety tenement on Essex Street, where even running water is not plenty and where the commonest necessities are all but neglected, costs its tenants 40 cents per square foot per year.

Private greed has wrought most of the evils of the tenements which must be undone by public philanthropy. The Board of Health through its sanitary laws can improve the sanitary condition of the tenements, but with high rents and resultant overcrowding it can, of course, do nothing. The discomfort of the individual tenant is, in a broad sense, not a matter of public concern. But that the same conditions which make the individual uncomfortable and unhappy affect in some measure 1,225,411 of the city's 1,513,501 inhabitants is of the greatest moment. There are 37,358 tenement houses in New York and they shelter fully 80 per cent. of the city's population. Half of that 80 per cent. is exposed to the full effect of the evil's worst phases.

Instances of the crowding of from seven to twelve persons into two small rooms are not unusual discoveries. Of course, in such circumstances, morality and cleanliness are impossible. Crowding like this is almost always a necessity, not a wilful act, from a tenant's point of view. It cannot but tend to wipe out, not only the conventionalities of civilization, but the very instincts of common decency. Homes cannot exist, and without the home the marriage relation is sure to languish, and drunkenness, vagrancy and kindred evils to increase. Husbands neglect their wives,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wives ignore their children, children regard their parents with hatred and distrust instead of filial love. The effect of such crowding on the bodies of its participants is quite as apparent. All sorts of preventable diseases flourish, cripples are common, and idiots—the result, generally, of unnatural family relations—are found frequently.

At this time, while temporary depression in the trades by which most tenement dwellers gain a livelihood has thrown thousands out of work, it would be unfair to write of existing destitution as typical, so I shall say nothing of it. The invariable rule may be laid down that when the tenement dweller can get work he works constantly and earns too little; when he cannot, he suffers, that is all. Hundreds have told me that even in the best of times they have no recreation other than liquor, and there are thousands, notably the Jews, who do not even get drunk.

All this is but the barest and most meagre outline of the situation which must be faced. Two methods of improvement are recommended—one the razing of old buildings and construction of new ones on better plans in the same districts in which the evil now is worst; the other the providing of cheap rapid transit to the suburbs and cheap homes for the poor there, with a view to depopulation of the crowded urban quarters.

EDWARD MARSHALL.

AMATEUR CLASSES IN NURSING.

IT HAS seemed to the writer that a more general knowledge of the latest methods of nursing the sick is desirable among all classes, and that enthusiastic young women might here find a new field for gaining and disseminating knowledge, and, consequently, increasing the sum of "happiness below." The idea is somewhat in line with the establishment of cooking schools, so beneficial in giving a new dignity to the laboratory of the kitchen, as well as disseminating new ideas of preparing food. There were times when such institutions were not needed, when, in our primitive civilization, and even in post colonial times, every woman found time to educate her daughter in plain and even fancy cooking. These luxurious later times find mothers so oppressed with social duties, so absorbed in reading and writing and calling and entertaining, in dressing and planning dresses, so dependent on servants, that what are, after all, important accomplishments, have been allowed to become "out-of-date." And yet, when emergency arises, many a woman would honestly confess she would willingly forget how to play a sonata if she only knew how to make a good salad or omelet.

This leads up to the consideration of a vocation that is even more out-of-date than the household cook, and that is the family nurse. We must repeat the old lamentations; life is not all a holiday, and not only will hunger and sickness come, but emergencies and ill-fortune will often throw the duties of cook or nurse on the members of the family. Why not, then, give the daughters a course of instruction in the art of nursing the sick as well as in schools of cookery? If the cook is as necessary to physical, mental, and even moral well-being as the engineer is necessary in the steamship's hold, the nurse is as indispensable as the pilot that we take on to thread the rocks and shoals, whether we are "crossing the bar" to the ocean or entering the harbor of health.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Happily, the household nurse is not yet wholly extinct. Many a fond mother keeps up the traditions of the old-fashioned nurse, devoted to her own loved ones in sickness, as well as ready to "lend a hand" when a neighbor is stricken. But there are modern methods, developed in our schools for nurses, such as that at Bellevue Hospital, which it seems would be of great value if disseminated among the people by supplementary schools for amateur nurses. It is not to be expected that these amateur nurses would encroach on the domain of the trained nurse so as to imperil the latter's means of livelihood. The amateur—using the word in its dignified sense, as one who follows a calling out of love for it—would not receive so thorough a practical training as the trained nurse at the hospitals; she would not assist at amputations or be left alone to perform the last duties in the hour of death. As for a superfluity of trained nurses, there is no prospect of it. It is altogether too hard to find good ones now in emergencies; and the trying work of such a life does not invite a great oversupply of devotees.

No, the idea is simply this: To instruct such of our daughters and wives as have time—even sons, if such will so devote themselves—so that they can care for the members of their own family, friends, or poor people, in ordinary sickness, according to the latest and best practice in nursing methods. Here, it seems, there is a field for real enthusiasm, real devotion, and keen interest in scientific methods, aided as it would be by the thought that the novitiate in nursing was learning how to care for her own loved ones, ease their hours of pain, or carry the benediction of intelligent service to the homes of the poor. Ah, it is only the sick sufferer who can tell how priceless to him is the trained hand and head, that knows just how to raise him in bed, just what to feed to him, how to do the numberless little things, a proper performance of which often turns the balance between health and disease, life and death. When to all the deftness of a trained nurse is added the loving sympathy of a sister or friend, the influences towards recovery are extra-magical. There is a luxury of content and trust and gratitude felt by an invalid who knows he has a faithful, loving nurse that goes far towards putting him, spiritually as well as morally, on the road to recovery. Let our young women once appreciate the value of being thus useful and they will be eager to learn all they can of an art that the doctors say is often more important than their own in saving life. The eye that sees a need and the hand that performs the deed for the invalid before he can ask it is indeed the eye and hand of "an angel in the house." Let us not be deceived. These are the valuable moments of life, when we have passed a cup of water to the suffering and really helped in the battle of existence.

It seems as if some regularly trained nurse, with experience in private nursing as well as her school diploma, might be found to give a course of lessons and lectures, with practical illustrations, to a class of girls and women, and so add to her income. So many details could be taught in a little while—arranging pillows, governing light, draughts, etc.; raising sick people in bed, preparing and administering medicines, what to do in emergencies, poisoning, scalding, drowning, choking, etc.; how to prepare poultices and blisters, what foods to give in different maladies and how to prepare them, etc., etc. A lecture on the symptoms, first treatment and care of cholera patients would be especially useful and timely. The class might have the benefit of oversight by some competent hospital physician who would give additional lectures on general topics as to care of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sick. It might be an encouragement to learners and stimulate a fellow-feeling of devotion to give attendants on the lectures who pass a satisfactory examination a certificate as to such attendance. This might entitle them to wear a simple pin with the initials of "Amateur Nurse" or "Home Nurse," giving a bond of sympathy with each other and a certain credential as to capacity in working among the poor. It is to be hoped that these suggestions may lead to the forming of some class in nursing, not as a "fad," but as a means of enlarging one's usefulness. Whether cholera comes or not, whether we have a war or not, the call for intelligent nursing of the sick is incessant and never fully answered. A girl may never do more than nurse Brother Tom through the grip or a Sunday-school scholar through the measles, but if she does that well, in the best way, she will have earned honor. Others, however, prepared or unprepared, must fight the dread enemy with their loved ones in the darkest of hours; and a course of lectures on nursing will be a great help to these nameless Florence Nightingales of our own homes.

C. H. CRANDALL.

THE RIGHT TO DIE.

A LEADING London paper has recently been conducting a gruesome discussion, under the caption "Tired of Life," upon the question, "Is suicide wrong?" It is significant that a large proportion of the writers who answer this query argue in favor of the moral right and sometimes the duty of self-destruction. Among other prominent contributors to this discussion is William Archer, the well-known dramatic critic, who, after asserting that nowhere in the Bible is suicide condemned, says: "What we want, what our grandsons, or great grandsons will probably have, is a commodious and scientific lethal chamber, which shall reduce to a minimum the physical terrors and inconveniences of suicide, both for the patient and for his family and friends. In a rational state of civilization, self-effacement should cost us no more physical screwing up of courage than a visit to the barber's, and much less than a visit to the dentist's. Mental effort will always keep people from wantonly and in mere caprice putting an end to themselves."

This morbid discussion has attracted great attention, and taken in conjunction with a recent magazine article, debating the question whether men and women have a right to kill their parents, relatives or friends, who labor under distressing diseases, or who believe that the time has come when they may depart, or who are worn out and useless to society, has suggested the title of this article.

To begin with, it is evident that such a question cannot be debated on Christian principles. These absolutely forbid a Christian to debate self murder. He accepts his life, and tries to do his best with it. He owns that he has no more right to kill himself than to kill any one else. He is a soldier who dares not desert his post. It is therefore necessary, while we write, to hold faith in abeyance. What we want to do is to show into what a dangerous sea the advanced thinkers have got.

The writer of the article in question is rather contradictory; but that is little to him. On the one hand, he denies the right of the State to execute a murderer. He argues that even when a man has forfeited all right to live

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by breaking into the sacred house of life and slaying a fellowman, he has no right to be deprived of his life. On the other hand, when a poor creature is so sick that his friends despair of him, he proposes that "the doctors should furnish the means which he would not possess himself" (of killing him). In support of his argument this writer quotes the advice of the late Mr. Charles Buxton, who, in a book of desultory thoughts recently published, declares that it is a pity "that the extinction of idiots and persons in their dotage should not be undertaken, let us say, by the bishop of the diocese."

Prof. Francis W. Newman, in giving his views of "Euthanasia," as they call the right to die, declares that "suicide is sometimes a duty." He relates how a friend of his some years ago "withdrew himself from life somewhat prematurely by chloroform." This phraseology is charming. All that De Quincy wrote in his savage satire on "Murder Considered as a Fine Art" fades before the description of a gentleman "withdrawing himself from life." "I have no doubt whatever," continues the Professor, "that he did it under a sense of duty." There are men who think that a painful, hopeless life ought to be ended; that when a sick man is helpless, he ought, out of mere politeness, to imitate the Japanese, and give himself the *hari-kari*, or happy dispatch. "I look with horror," says Professor Newman, "on allowing tender kinsfolk (or nurses!) to sacrifice youthful health in order to add days or weeks to my life when worn out," and if to "my life," then to the life of another! "The registrar would be required to interrogate the patient before witnesses, who would attest his desire of death. I do not understand how anyone can fear abuse if death were legalized, under deliberately planned restrictions, such as I have hinted."

Another advanced thinker—a woman—arguing in the same vein, declares that the executioners of Booth, the assassin of President Lincoln, kept the murderer alive for twenty-two hours with brandy to prolong his tortures; and her logic—a woman's logic—is that we who nurse our sick relatives and keep them alive for "an hour, or a day, or longer," are equally brutal. Perhaps the better way to meet such arguments as this would be to ridicule them. But, apart from any other consideration, has it never occurred to those who advocate that incurables should be put out of the world, that many an illness which in former times was considered incurable would still have remained so had the sufferer been removed when doctors pronounced the case hopeless. In fact had this cowardly shrinking from life been fostered, our science would have been on a par with the science of the Chinese.

The man who, tired of life, or wearied of sickness, quits his post and deserts to the enemy, possesses false courage. To escape at perhaps the critical moment, would be to own one's self not fitted for this life, much less for another. And, besides, how is a man to know when he shall recover and when his life is useless? We do not wish to import Christian witnesses into this discussion, because they are fortified by faith, and often eagerly welcome death when it comes naturally. But it is safe to presume that in really civilized nations the fear of death will prevent most men from following the advice of these advanced thinkers and seeking the aid of the King of Terrors. We all know the Æsopian fable of the old man who, calling upon death to relieve him of his burden, was only too glad to send away the spectre when it came; and the easy philosopher who prepares himself to die will find, when he looks death in the face, that it needs another kind of courage than that given by sickness and *ennui* to meet it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If morbid discussions of the kind I have outlined are a sign of progress, what, then, is retrogression? In olden times the Romans, when an epidemic of suicide had broken out among the Roman matrons and maidens, checked it by passing a law that the suicides should have their bodies exposed naked in the market place. This brought the women to their senses, and thenceforward they consented to live. Are we more savage than the heathen of that time?

Of much modern thought it must be said that it has become licentious. It needs discipline; so much so, that deep thinkers, finding that liberty degenerates into license, have more or less retired to the safer anchorage of conservatism. Have we not gone far enough in such debates? Have not advanced thinkers had "rope enough to hang themselves"? Do we not know men by their fruits? The advanced thinkers debate the rights of property, the right of labor, the right to die. They want to knock away every pale that can keep a man to the straight, safe, and right path. We are to break up the Ten Commandments and to throw the Bible out of the schools. We are to take "any man's horses," like Falstaff; and now it is proposed to legalize the putting an end to our own lives, if we are weak and sulky, or those of our relatives whom we are tired of nursing. Are we to walk any longer in such muckpits and bogholes? Are we, in the spirit of true liberty, to submit ourselves, like good soldiers, to the great Commander, to walk in soberness, honesty, restraint, temperance, duty, and self-control? Or are we, in the spirit of morbid, sulky, and priggish boys, to clamor for the right of doing just as we please, and sacrifice our own souls? Is it not time that we ask, Whither are we going?

GERTRUDE B. ROLFE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED